DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 412 HE 003 654

TITLE	New Academic Institutions: A Survey.
INSTITUTION	American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	130p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Colleges; *Educational Development; *Educational Philosophy; *Educational Planning; *Higher Education; Surveys; Universities

ABSTRACT

More than a third of the colleges and universities in operation in the U.S. in 1970 were created after 1947. This important fact has lead to the creation of the present study whose purpose was to gather data about the numbers and kinds of new institutions, the circumstances of their founding, their common and distinctive characteristics, their special problems, their failures and their successes. The investigation was in part a response to the educational community's expressed need for statistical data on a significant historical development in American higher education. In addition, it was hoped that the findings would be useful to lay leaders and other policy makers who from time to time take on the responsibility of establishing new institutions. (HS)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 070412

New Academic Institutions:

A Survey

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPY RIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
American Council on Education
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 003654

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

New Academic Institutions

New Academic Institutions: A Survey

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION · *Washington, D.C.*

© 1972 by the American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036
Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 72-89364
ISBN 0-8268-1351-8
Printed in the United States of America

Preface

NEW ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS: A SURVEY

An important yet little known fact about American higher education is that more than a third of the 2,573 colleges and universities existing in 1970 were created after 1947. Although whole books have been published about a few of these "new" institutions, the paucity of general information about most of them led the American Council on Education in 1967 to begin a systematic inquiry. Its purpose was to gather data about the numbers and kinds of new institutions, the circumstances of their founding, their common and distinctive characteristics, their special problems, their failures and successes. The Council's investigation was in part a response to the educational community's expressed need for statistical data on a significant historical development in American higher education. In addition, it was hoped that the findings would be useful to lay leaders and other policy makers who from time to time take on the responsibility of establishing new institutions.

Randall M. Whaley, who had been Chancellor of the University of Missouri at Kansas City, was engaged by the Council to help launch the study. Through a rather lengthy questionnaire and numerous campus visitations, he gathered much of the information on which the present report is based. When Dr. Whaley left the Council to assume another position in 1968, various members of the Council's executive and professional staff, including most notably Charles Andersen, gave some time and attention to verifying and augmenting the accumu-

lated statistics at hand. In the early phase of the study, more than twenty case studies by individual authors were commissioned. The expectation was that these would be published under the authors' names in a rather lengthy book about new institutions. Even though some of the case studies were very insightful, the individual reports and analyses were not at all comparable in their approaches and did not lend themselves to valid generalizations. Accordingly, they were finally used to illuminate, wherever pertinent, quantitative data obtained from other sources.

For an extended period, carrying forward the Council's study of new institutions was nobody's particular assignment, and it looked as if the whole effort might come to naught in published results. Toward the end of 1970, however, the Council engaged the interest of Professor Nicholas J. Demerath of Washington University in the project. From January of 1971 through August of that year, he worked at pulling the varied materials together, updating and enlarging relevant dates and drafting a manuscript. This manuscript in turn went through several revisions. The report presented here is not the work of any single author, or even of any group of authors working in unison. It would thus be inappropriate for the Council to publish this monograph under the name or names of particular individuals, but appreciation is due all who made a contribution to the study.

Although this report does not presume to set forth everything anyone may need to know about the establishment of new institutions, it does bring together in organized form some hitherto unknown facts. It also gives the judgments of persons who have had key responsibili-

ties in launching colleges and universities. Their commentaries are replete with object lessons about what to do and what not to do in a task that is not an easy one even under the most favorable circumstances. New Academic Institutions contains both facts and opinions, and intentionally so, but the reader should have no particular difficulty in separating the two. The facts are mostly in the tables, which are numerous. The opinions are usually those of experienced educators engaged on the scene being described, with views of the Council's researchers deliberately minimized.

The first chapter defines terms and describes the methods employed to gather data. Chapter II gives an overview of the new institutions. Chapter III sets forth the why and hows of getting started and makes a strong case for the importance of adequate planning. "The Educational Composite" is outlined in Chapter IV, which treats such concerns as defining purposes, making educational programs, getting accredited, attracting faculty and students, and presidential opinions as to the relative importance and difficulty of major problems. Picking a location, acquiring land for the campus, developing a library and other necessary campus facilities are some of the topics dealt with in Chapter V. The pitfalls of altogether too many new institutions are conspicuous in the next chapter, "Budgeting and Finance." Chapter VII on "The Leadership Function" lets the reader share the thinking of trustees and presidents in prospect and retrospect about the realities of institution founding and developing. The final chapter, "Change and Vitality," tells us something in the statistic showing that since 1947 approximately a third of the in-

stitutions have changed their names. Various other adaptive measures are listed in terms of the perceived order of difficulty and importance. Although student reactions to any of the concerns are seldom apparent, and the various faculties involved are rarely cited, Chapter VIII summarizes presidential opinions about the most significant changes and successes in their institutions.

Table of Contents

		Page
	Preface	v
	List of Tables	xi
I.	Introduction	1
II.	An Overview of the New Institutions	7
III.	Getting Started	28
IV.	The Educational Composite	55
V.	The Educational Apparatus	74
VI.	Budgeting and Finance	88
VII.	The Leadership Function	97
VIII.	Change and Vitality	108

List of Tables

Table		Page
2.1	U.S. Postsecondary Institutions, Selected Years, from 1770 to 1970	7
2.2	ACE List of "New" Institutions Founded between 1947 and 1967, by Control and Type	9
2.3	"New" Institutions to USOE Directory from 1947-48 to 1970-71	11
2.4	"New" Institutions by First Appearance in USOE Directory from 1947-48 to 1970-71, Type and Control	12
2.5	Percentage of "New" Institution Distribution by First Appearance in USOE Directory from 1947-48 to 1970-71, Type and Control	12
2.6	Control of "New" Institutions by First Appearance in USOE Directory from 1947-48 to 1970-71, and Type	13
2.7	"New" Institutions "Dropped" from the USOE Directory from 1947-48 to 1970-71, by Year of First Appearance	14
2.8	Percentage of "New" Institutions "Dropped" from USOE Directory from 1947-48 to 1970-71, by Type and Control	14
2.9	Percentage of "New" Institutions "Dropped" from USOE Directory from 1947-48 to 1970-71, by Control and Age	16
2.10	"New" Institutions Established between 1947 and 1967, by Region and State	17
2.11	Classification of Types of Control of "New" Institutions	20

List of Tables, cont'd.

Table		Page
2.12	"New" Institutions from 1947 to 1967, by Control and Type	21
2.13	"New" Institutions from 1947 to 1967, by Type and Control	22
2.14	Initial Enrollment at "New" Institutions by Type, Year of First Appearance in USOE Directory, 1947-48 to 1970-71	24
2.15	"New" Institutions by Size, Type and Control, Fall 1967	25
2.16	Percentage of Students Housed on Campus in First Year of Classes and 1967 by Type and Control	27
3.1	Presidents' Rating of Most Important Considerations in Deciding to Create a New Institution by Type of Institution	29
3.2	Enrollments and Needs in the Major Fields of Vocational Education in the U.S	32
3.3	Authority for Establishing New Institutions of Higher Education in the Fifty States and D.C	38
3.4	Authority for Approving New Degrees and Programs at Institutions of Higher Education in the Fifty States and D.C	39
3.5	Presidents' Rating of Importance of Planning by Type and Size of Institution	49
3.6	Presidents' Rating of Difficulty of Planning by Type and Size of Institution	50
3.7	Presidents' Rating of Factors in Early Development by Type of Institution	51
4.1	Presidents' Rating of Handling of Educational Program Problems in Early Development of "New" Institutions, by Type	57

List of Tables, cont'd.

Table		Page
4.2	Number and Percentage Distribution of "New" Institutions by Year of Accreditation and Year of First Instruction, from 1947 to 1967.....	61
4.3	Selected Credit Regulations (Percentage Distribution Allowed at Responding Four-Year Institutions).....	63
4.4	Percentage Distribution of Institutions, by Sex of Student Bodies.....	65
4.5	Change in Composition of Student Body Since 1963.....	66
4.6	Presidents' Rating of Handling of Student Problems in Early Development of "New" Institutions by Type....	68
4.7	Presidents' Rating of Handling of Faculty Problems in Early Development of "New" Institutions by Type....	69
4.8	Presidents' Rating of Importance and Difficulty of Eight Faculty-Related Problems by Institutional Types.....	71
5.1	Percentage of "New" Institutions Renting Real Estate.....	75
5.2	Average Campus Acreage of "New" Institutions by Type, in Year Classes Began.....	75
5.3	Presidents' Rating of Difficulty of Providing Physical Facilities by Type of Institution.....	79
5.4	Presidents' Rating of Difficulty of Providing Physical Facilities by Size of Institution.....	80
5.5	Presidents' Rating of Importance of Providing Physical Facilities by Type of Institution.....	80
5.6	Presidents' Rating of Importance of Providing Physical Facilities by Size of Institution.....	81

List of Tables, cont'd.

Table		Page
5.7	Percentage of Library Resources by Type of Institution.....	84
5.8	Utilization of Instructional Technology.....	86
6.1	Presidents' Rating of Importance and Difficulty of Financial Problems by Control of Institution.....	92
6.2	Presidents' Rating of Importance and Difficulty of Financial Problems by Type of Institution.....	93
6.3	Presidents' Rating of Importance and Difficulty of Financial Problems by Size of Institution.....	94
6.4	Precentage Distribution of Institutions by Size of Budget for First Year of Classes and 1967, and Type.....	96
7.1	Presidents' Rating of Organizational and Leadership Problems by Control of Institution.....	98
8.1	Percentage of Institutions that Changed Names by Control, Type, and Size of Institution.....	109
8.2	Presidents' Most Frequently Mentioned Changes and Successes by Type, Control, and Size of Institution.....	111
8.3	Six Least Frequently Mentioned Changes and Successes by Type of Institution.....	113
8.4	Presidents' Rating of Importance and Difficulty of Four Adaptive Measures by Type of Institution.....	115
8.5	Presidents' Rating of Importance and Difficulty of Four Adaptive Measures by Size of Institution.....	116

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Although colleges and universities are often stereotyped in the public mind as venerable institutions, of the 2,573 postsecondary institutions listed by the U.S. Office of Education for this country in the year 1970 almost 1,000 were founded since 1947. The present study is about this latter group of institutions. Two-thirds were founded as two-year community colleges, the others as four-year colleges and postbaccalaureate institutions. Of the new institutions, 55 percent were sponsored and controlled by public agencies; and 45 percent by private.

Since the Civil War, an average of about fifty new colleges has started annually, but this average masks wide variation from one decade or year to the next. The starts have been spasmodic. In the 1950s the number of institutions begun each year averaged around thirty; in the sixties it was twice as great. Now, in the early seventies, the number of new starts has dropped back closer to the former figure.

The vital statistics of American higher education include, of course, endings as well as beginnings, and both have been fitful. In some periods the attrition rate for institutions has been higher than in others. Between 1860 and 1970, the aggregate number of postsecondary institutions increased from 182 to 2,573, so that births obviously exceeded deaths, but in the private sector the number currently going out of existence may exceed the number being founded. (ACE data show that 100 of the institutions founded during the survey period no longer existed in 1971.)

Individually as well as collectively, new institutions of higher education represent considerable investments of talent, time, money, and hope. There are lessons to be learned from failures as well as from successes, and the need for more knowledge about such ventures has long been manifest. In response to this need, the American Council on Education began a study of new institutions in 1967. Initial inquiry revealed that nobody even had a complete list of institutions initiated during the two prior decades, the period chosen for study. Extensive investigation finally led to the conclusion that during this period 939 institutions were started. When these had been identified and located, a detailed questionnaire was sent to each of them. Of the 600 returns, 552 were usable, and the data they supplied are the bases for most of the tables in this report. The percentage of returns, incidentally, was about the same for junior and senior level institutions.

For the purposes of the study, an institution of higher education was defined as "Any institution chartered to offer instruction for credit at the postsecondary level. Such would include colleges and universities; business and technical and vocational schools; community and junior colleges; and professional schools not otherwise officially part of another institution. Included are all institutions, public and private, regardless of nature of control or of support."

To be included as a <u>new</u> institution, the charter must have been issued in 1947 or in any subsequent year. Because of mergers, changes of name, location, purposes, etc., arriving at a clear and unambiguous definition of "new" was difficult. The definition used in the questionnaire set forth the following specifications:

1. All entirely new institutions public and private, chartered during or after 1947, with new governing boards, facilities, staff and faculties.

2. All new campuses or branches established during or since 1947 of a public or private university or college, or part of a state system, so long as the new campus gives complete programs leading to diplomas or degrees. (Thus, extension centers which give some credit courses but which do not have complete programs are excluded. Branch campuses providing for completion of diploma or degree requirements, and in general serving a different geographic area from that served by a main campus, are included.)

3. An institution which merged with another institution and in the process underwent an extensive and significant change in mission, size, character of program, or support. It was decided that borderline cases would be included in the initial analysis, although they might subsequently be treated in a different category.

Recipients of the questionnaire were also asked to adhere to certain other definitions of terms, as follows:

1. Faculty size: Use head count only. Numbers for full-time faculty should be for those regular, full-time employees identified with the faculty, regardless of how their time is distributed among research, teaching, administration, or other duties. For part-time faculty use numbers of those engaged in classroom or laboratory instruction or service. This would exclude research fellows, technicians, and others not engaged in teaching activities.

2. Education and general funds: Include all funds, from all sources, used for instructional, research, extension, academic support and administration, and public service programs. Exclude, for example, self-liquidating enterprises such as residence halls, parking facilities, and student unions.

3. Enrollments: Numbers requested are those head counts made customarily in the fall for official reports, excluding enrollees in noncredit continuing education programs, but including credit courses taken in extension centers. If exact figures are not available for early years requested, use very best estimate possible.

4. Reasonable assurance of accreditation: The date requested is that given by a regional accrediting association following completion of the association's preliminary steps, prior to giving full accreditation.

It may be useful here to point out certain distinctions in terms used in the tables of this report. "Public" and "private" refer to mode of legal control rather than to institutional affiliation or support. "Type" of institution in this study signifies two-year, four-year, or postbaccalaureate. The definition of a two-year institution generally follows that used by the United States Office of Education (USOE), but definitions of the other two differ significantly from what might seem to be their equivalents in federal terminology. The four-year college category as used in this study includes institutions offering a four or five-year baccalaureate degree program as their most advanced program of study; this category includes most liberal arts colleges. The postbaccalaureate institutions are those providing master's, doctor's, or first professional degree programs, and it is the

category with the most heterogeneous membership, both as to size and to variety of programs. Institutions which have undergone changes in classification were assigned categories as of the time of their response to the questionnaire.

Data obtained from institutional responses to the questionnaire are also complemented here and there in the text of this report with information gathered from visits to the campuses of thirty-five of the new institutions of different types and regions. Also, detailed case studies were commissioned for eighteen of the new institutions, but it proved infeasible to include them in this report, except through incidental reference.

The findings of the Council's study of new institutions are for the most part to be noted in the tabular presentations and other statistical arrays of this report. A number of generalizations may be derived by the reader from the information set forth, but some are summarized here by way of illustration:

1. Carefully done feasibility studies are more characteristic of the public sector when proposed new institutions are to be parts of systems than they are of the private sector when a new college is being contemplated.

2. Commonplace shortcomings in planning are failure to take into account sufficiently: demographic characteristics of the locality or area to be served; competition from established institutions; adequate financing, long- as well as short-range; and availability of physical facilities when needed.

3. From their outset, all new institutions necessarily involve some planning, but few develop and operate with a continuous process of analyzing options, operations, and outcomes.

4. Most presidents of new institutions consider financial support to be one of their most difficult problems, but only a minority of them install modern budgeting, productivity, and cost control systems.

5. Community colleges in and around large urban centers are most likely to attract sizable opening enrollments and to grow at a steady pace.

6. Recently founded private, sectarian, or church-related colleges are in the category of institutions most susceptible to disappearance or loss of identity.

7. The outlays required today to establish and maintain a large university of the first-order of excellence are virtually prohibitive under the usual modes of sponsorship.

8. There is undoubtedly a need for more innovative types of institutions, but they, too, require careful planning and management, together with adequate resource bases.

Chapter II

AN OVERVIEW OF THE NEW INSTITUTIONS

The registration of vital events in the population of academic institutions is less accurate, perhaps, than the U.S. Census. Consequently, rates of institutional births and deaths cannot be computed accurately because the base populations are only estimates. Nevertheless, some estimates can be made from data in standard histories of higher education and the directories of the U.S. Office of Education. Table 2.1 gives approximate totals of institutions in existence at various times, and the average annual increase during each period.

TABLE 2.1

United States Postsecondary Institutions, Selected Years, from 1770 to 1970 (Estimates)

Year	No.	Increase from Prior Year	Average Annual Increase
1770	9	-	-
1870	250	241	2.4
1920	1,041	791	15.8
1930	1,409	368	36.8
1940	1,708	299	29.9
1950	1,851	143	14.3
1960	2,008	157	15.7
1970	2,525	517	51.7

Net increases, of course, are not founding rates, but differences between institutional births and deaths in any time period. Births of

postsecondary institutions in the years shown obviously were greater than the net increases; how much greater can only be surmised. The death rate for older institutions may be lower than for new ones, reflecting the general vulnerability of the young and the hardiness of the old.

By 1870 there were 250 colleges and universities in the United States. Many more were founded but closed, as one observer has noted, the casualties of "financial disaster, denominational competition, unfavorable location, natural catastrophes, and internal dissension." Between 1636 and 1770 only nine postsecondary institutions were established, but from 1770 to 1870 an estimated 891 were founded. All nine of those started in the colonial period survived, but of the 891 founded later -- mainly in the 1840s and 1850s -- 650 were gone by 1870. Thus, over the 100 years, an average of 8.9 institutions were established each year, and an average of 6.5 ceased to exist.

How do these figures compare with those for the period of the ACE survey? Over the twenty-one year period from 1947 to 1967 (see table 2.2), new institutions of higher education were founded at a rate of about forty-five a year. Postbaccalaureate institutions and four-year colleges, especially private ones, were founded at about the same rate from one year to the next. Even private two-year colleges were founded at a relatively steady pace; but the data show that community colleges in the public sector experienced a tremendous growth during this same period. From 1952, when only one was founded, the number jumped so that in 1965 seventy-six were founded. The data also show an increase in the number of new public institutions from 1957 to 1967, an average of forty-eight a year, compared to sixteen a year for new private institutions.

TABLE 2.2

ACE List of "New" Institutions Founded between 1947 and 1967, by Control and Type (N=939)

Year	Public				Private				GRAND TOTAL
	2-Year	4-Year	Postbaccalaureate	Sub-Total	2-Year	4-Year	Postbaccalaureate	Sub-total	
1947 . . .	13	2	4	19	1	8	4	13	32
1948 . . .	12	-	1	13	6	5	2	13	26
1949 . . .	6	-	1	7	5	5	3	13	20
1950 . . .	6	-	2	8	6	7	3	16	24
1951 . . .	1	-	1	2	4	5	4	13	15
1952 . . .	1	-	1	2	5	5	3	13	15
1953 . . .	4	-	-	4	7	6	1	14	18
1954 . . .	4	1	1	6	7	8	2	17	23
1955 . . .	6	1	-	7	3	14	5	22	29
1956 . . .	7	4	3	14	8	7	1	16	30
1957 . . .	25	-	6	31	7	4	2	13	44
1958 . . .	23	1	2	26	9	6	3	18	44
1959 . . .	16	2	3	21	5	7	-	12	33
1960 . . .	29	4	4	37	8	7	1	16	53
1961 . . .	39	-	3	42	7	6	1	14	56
1962 . . .	31	2	-	33	9	11	5	25	58
1963 . . .	58	5	6	69	2	12	2	16	85
1964 . . .	46	-	2	48	3	5	4	12	60
1965 . . .	76	2	4	82	11	15	2	28	110
1966 . . .	63	4	3	70	6	6	1	13	83
1967 . . .	63	3	3	69	4	7	1	12	81
Total . .	529	31	50	610	123	156	50	349	939

What accounts for the dramatic increase in institutions of higher education, especially in the public sector, beginning in 1957? The underlying causes were the same ones generic to much social and economic change: population growth, urbanization, industrialization, technological development. The trigger factors immediately affecting the educational scene were: sputnik, upgraded job requirements, more extensive public demand for postsecondary

schooling, more financial aid to students and more funds for colleges, and California legislation establishing junior college districts. Whereas the great majority of junior colleges in all states in 1955 were extensions of high schools, and administered in local districts along with primary and secondary schools, the dominant pattern today is quite different. In 1956, the California state legislature established separate districts for junior or community colleges which resulted in numerous high school appendages rapidly declaring their independence. Thus, scores of two-year institutions that had not been counted as autonomous institutions before were so enumerated. The practice that began in California swept across the country in a short time. Separate districts were established in state after state, and the number of community colleges grew as a result of new starts as well as from colleges emerging out of high schools.

To supplement the data contained in the ACE list of 939 new institutions directories of higher education published annually by the U.S. Office of Education were examined. From them basic information on all or nearly all of the institutions created in the last twenty-five years was obtained. The method was simple. First, all of the institutions that were added to the directories from 1947-48 through 1970-71 were listed. Then this list was checked aginst several directories that provided college founding dates (American Universities and Colleges, American Junior Colleges, College Facts Chart). Using this procedure researchers eliminated institutions which, though long in existence, had only recently satisfied some technical or accreditation qualification required by the Office of Education for inclusion in its directory. The resulting "clean" roster closely approximated the ACE list for the period from 1947-48 to 1970-71 (see table 2.3), hereafter referred to as "new" institutions.

TABLE 2.3

"New" Institutions to USOE Directory from 1947-48 to 1970-71

Year of Founding	Number of New Institutions	
	ACE List	USOE Directory
1947-48	32	32
1948-49	26	36
1949-50	20	40
1950-51	24	45
1951-52	15	16
1952-53	15	30
1953-54	18	25
1954-55	23	19
1955-56	29	21
1956-57	30	43
1957-58	44	36
1958-59	44	32
1959-60	33	39
1960-61	53	49
1961-62	56	52
1962-63	58	35
1963-64	85	62
1964-65	60	51
1965-66	110	63
1966-67	83	83
1967-68	81	114
21-Year Total	939	923
1968-69	-	86
1969-70	-	65
1970-71	-	5
24-Year Total	-	1,079

The USOE data permitted categorization by public and private control and by two-year and four-year types of institution. Table 2.4 shows the number of "new" institutions by control, type and first year of appearance in a directory. When these data are converted to percentages (table 2.5), the trend noted in the ACE sample is corroborated. That is, a growing proportion of "new" institutions is two-year public institutions.

TABLE 2.4

"New" Institutions by First Appearance in USOE Directory from 1947-48 to 1970-71, Type and Control

First Appearance in USOE Directory	Number of Institutions					
	Type			Control		
	All	2-Year	4-Year	All	Public	Private
1947-48 -- 1950-51 . . .	153	98	55	153	65	88
1951-52 -- 1955-56 . . .	111	51	60	111	26	85
1956-57 -- 1960-61 . . .	199	125	74	199	83	116
1961-62 -- 1965-66 . . .	263	190	73	263	166	97
1966-67 -- 1970-71 . . .	353	261	92	353	249	104
24-Year Total	1,079	725	354	1,079	589	490

TABLE 2.5

Percentage of "New" Institution Distribution by First Appearance in USOE Directory from 1947-48 to 1970-71, Type and Control

First Appearance in USOE Directory	Percentage of Institutions					
	Type			Control		
	All	2-Year	4-Year	All	Public	Private
1947-48 -- 1950-51 . . .	100	64	36	100	42	58
1951-52 -- 1955-56 . . .	100	46	54	100	23	77
1956-57 -- 1960-61 . . .	100	63	37	100	42	58
1961-62 -- 1965-66 . . .	100	72	28	100	63	37
1966-67 -- 1970-71 . . .	100	74	26	100	71	29

When these data are further refined (table 2.6), it is apparent that although an overwhelming proportion of the "new" two-year institutions is public, most of the "new" four-year colleges are private. Furthermore, unlike the two-year sector, which has changed from approximately 60 percent public control to 90 percent, the four-year sector has maintained a fairly stable public/private distribution. Eighteen percent of the "new" four-year institutions were public in the 1947-50 period, and 13 percent were public in the most recent quinquennium.

TABLE 2.6

Control of "New" Institutions by First Appearance in USOE Directory from 1947-48 to 1970-71, and Type

First Appearance in USOE Directory	Percentage of Institutions		
	Total	Public	Private
		2-Year	
1947-48 -- 1950-51	100	56	43
1951-52 -- 1955-56	100	43	57
1956-57 -- 1960-61	100	55	45
1961-62 -- 1965-66	100	77	23
1966-67 -- 1970-71	100	91	9
24-Year Total	100	73	27
		4-Year	
1947-48 -- 1950-51	100	18	82
1951-52 -- 1955-56	100	7	93
1956-57 -- 1960-61	100	19	81
1961-62 -- 1965-66	100	27	73
1966-67 -- 1970-71	100	13	87
24-Year Total	100	17	83

Drops and Deaths

USOE directories also provided data on institutions that were dropped from the directories. For the purposes of this analysis, "dropped" institutions are considered as closed or dead. Some institutions were "dropped" because they failed to meet certain USOE technical or accreditation criteria, not because they actually closed down. Although some of these may still exist, they are not counted in the official USOE statistics of 2,600 institutions of higher education in the nation.

Table 2.7 shows the number of "new" institutions that were "dropped" from the directories, by the quinquennium in which they first appeared. Such data should point to some period, if any, in which particularly hardy institutions were formed. No such period is evident. The largest number and highest percentage of "drops" occurred in the earliest period from 1947-48 to 1950-51. Of the 153 institutions that appeared for the first time in that quinquennium, thirty-eight, or 25 percent, were "dropped" by 1970-71.

TABLE 2.7

"New" Institutions "Dropped" from the USOE Directory
from 1947-48 to 1970-71, by Year of First Appearance

First Appearance in USOE Directory	Number of "New" Institutions	Institutions "Dropped"	
		Number	Percentage of "New" Institutions
1947-48 -- 1950-51	153	38	25
1951-52 -- 1955-56	111	23	21
1956-57 -- 1960-61	199	29	15
1961-62 -- 1965-66	263	24	9
1966-67 -- 1970-71	353	19	5
24-Year Total	1,079	133	12

TABLE 2.8

Percentage of "New" Institutions "Dropped" from USOE Directory
from 1947-48 to 1970-71, by Type and Control

First Appearance in USOE Directory	Number "Dropped"		Percentage "Dropped"	
	Public	Private	Public	Private
	2-Year Institutions			
1947-48 -- 1950-51	15	11	27	26
1951-52 -- 1955-56	1	5	5	17
1956-57 -- 1960-61	5	14	7	25
1961-62 -- 1965-66	6	6	4	14
1966-67 -- 1970-71	7	7	3	29
24-Year Total	34	43	6	22
	4-Year Institutions			
1947-48 -- 1950-51	-	12	-	27
1951-52 -- 1955-56	-	17	-	30
1956-57 -- 1960-61	-	10	-	17
1961-62 -- 1965-66	1	11	5	21
1966-67 -- 1970-71	-	5	-	6
24-Year Total	1	55	2	19

Overall, there has been in the past twenty-five years a rather steady rate of attrition. Twenty-five percent of the institutions established about twenty-five years ago have disappeared and 21 percent of those established about twenty years ago are gone. If this pattern continues, it is reasonable to assume that by 1976, an additional half dozen institutions established in the earliest period will have closed.

Table 2.8 provides a more detailed analysis of the institutional "drop-out" rate divided by control and type of institution. The private sector shows the greatest degree of attrition. One-fourth of the private institutions that first appeared between 1947 and 1950 have subsequently disappeared. Although fewer private institutions were created in the past twenty-five years, almost three times as many private institutions as public have disappeared. By way of comparison, only one public four-year institution was "dropped" from the directories and only thirty-four of the 529 "new" public two-year institutions are no longer listed.

Table 2.9 shows the number of the "drop-outs" as well as their "age" at the time. In general, attrition occurred most frequently in the first five years of existence. Only in the period from 1956-57 to 1960-61 did greater attrition occur <u>after</u> the first five years. The attrition during the first five years in the period from 1947-48 to 1950-51 was about equal in both public and private sectors, 12 and 11 percent respectively. Since that time, however, attrition in the first five years for public institutions has dropped considerably below that for private. The first five year attrition rate for <u>private</u> institutions generally has remained constant for each of the five-year periods, ranging between 9 and 12 percent.

TABLE 2.9

Percentage of "New" Institutions "Dropped" from USOE Directory from 1947-48 to 1970-71, by Control and Age

First Appearance in USOE Directory	Percentage "Dropped", by Age			
	1-5 Years	6-10 Years	11-15 Years	10 or More Years
	All Institutions			
1947-48 -- 1950-51	12	7	1	5
1951-52 -- 1955-56	9	5	6	-
1956-57 -- 1960-61	6	8	1	-
1961-62 -- 1965-66	6	3	-	-
1966-67 -- 1970-71	5	-	-	-
	Public Institutions			
1947-48 -- 1950-51	12	3	2	6
1951-52 -- 1955-56	-	-	4	-
1956-57 -- 1960-61	1	5	-	-
1961-62 -- 1965-66	4	-	-	-
1966-67 -- 1970-71	3	-	-	-
	Private Institutions			
1947-48 -- 1950-51	11	10	1	3
1951-52 -- 1955-56	12	7	7	-
1956-57 -- 1960-61	9	9	2	-
1961-62 -- 1965-66	10	7	-	-
1966-67 -- 1970-71	12	-	-	-

Location and Distribution of the New Institutions

At least one or more new institutions were founded in fifty states, the District of Columbia, and the territories of Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands between 1947 and 1967. Table 2.10 shows that the region with the most new institutions was the Southeast (224); the one with the fewest, the Rocky Mountain (twenty-five). California led the states with a total of ninety-five. New York was second with eighty-four, followed by North Carolina with fifty-one, and Pennsylvania and Illinois with forty-six each.

TABLE 2.10

"New" Institutions Established between 1947 and 1967, by Region and State

Region and State	Survey List	Ret. Usable Questionnaires	Region and State	Survey List	Ret. Usable Questionnaires
All Regions	939	552			
New England	78	42	Plains	73	43
Connecticut	21	10	Iowa	17	11
Maine	5	5	Kansas	7	4
Massachusetts	23	16	Minnesota	18	11
New Hampshire	16	6	Missouri	18	9
Rhode Island	5	2	Nebraska	7	4
Vermont	8	3	North Dakota	3	3
			South Dakota	3	1
Mideast	179	109			
Delaware	4	1	Southwest	67	34
Dist. of Col.	3	-	Arizona	11	4
Maryland	19	12	New Mexico	12	6
New Jersey	23	13	Oklahoma	5	3
New York	84	48	Texas	39	21
Pennsylvania	46	35			
			Rocky Mountain	25	12
Southeast	224	139	Colorado	13	8
Alabama	18	10	Idaho	4	2
Arkansas	3	2	Montana	1	1
Florida	40	30	Utah	2	-
Georgia	12	8	Wyoming	5	1
Kentucky	14	9			
Louisiana	13	7	Far West	146	78
Mississippi	10	4	Alaska	7	5
North Carolina	51	31	California	95	50
South Carolina	19	12	Hawaii	8	5
Tennessee	13	8	Nevada	2	1
Virginia	22	13	Oregon	18	9
West Virginia	9	5	Washington	16	8
Great Lakes	139	92	Outlying Parts	8	3
Illinois	46	34	Guam	1	-
Indiana	6	4	Puerto Rico	6	2
Michigan	36	26	Virgin Islands	1	1
Ohio	38	20			
Wisconsin	13	8			

When the number of "new" institutions established by region is compared with the population of each region, the Southeast and the Middle East hold positions one and two, respectively, in both measures. The Far West, third in the number of institutions founded, stands fourth in population, whereas the opposite is true in the Great Lakes states which stand fourth in new institutions and third in population. Last in both measures is the Rocky Mountain region.

The question of how well the educational needs of the country's population were met during this time period is beyond the scope of this study. It may be noted, however, that the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, in The Capitol and the Campus (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1971), found that according to 1968 statistics, for every hundred people of college age in Alaska, Georgia, Nevada, South Carolina, and Virginia, fewer than thirty places were provided in public and private higher education institutions. This was one of four criteria the Commission used to determine the adequacy of state support. The others were (1) a graduation rate of 70 percent or better for high school students, (2) an expenditure for higher education through state and local taxes equal to .6 percent or more of per capita income, and (3) a net export rate less than 15,000 college students per year. Four states failed to meet two of the four criteria: Connecticut, Georgia, New Jersey, and Virginia. To what extent adequacy so defined will become an objective for the states remains to be seen.

Sponsorship and Control

At the beginning of the period covered in this study, the matter of "control" of institutions was generally much less complicated than it is today. The terms "public" and "private" were, for the most part, mutually exclusive and clear-cut, as was the distinction between sectarian and non-sectarian institutions. Within the public sector, the overwhelming majority of institutions could readily be identified as having either state, county, district, or municipal control.

Today even so basic a classification as "public" or "private" is not always clear. For example, how does one categorize a "state related" institution? Within the private sector, institutions claim nonsectarian status though they may be directed by clergy who in the very recent past emphasized their ties with religious organizations. Within the public sector, layers of control have developed to such an extent that an institution may be considered to have state control or county or district control, depending on the level the classifier wants to emphasize.

This ambiguity is not confined to laymen. Leaders do not always agree on how to classify their own institutions. Questionnaires from more than a dozen junior colleges of a similar type in one state showed a wide variance in responses to the control question. Three-fifths of the respondents indicated control by a district; nearly one-fifth indicated state control, either as an autonomous state institution or as a part of a state system; some respondents reported city control and some indicated "public control, other." These responses came from two-year institutions in a state that has a junior college board providing general direction to district institutions with locally elected boards of trustees.

In table 2.11 responses from the public sector were edited somewhat in order to obtain a greater degree of consistency. Public two-year institutions are classified as "locally controlled" in those states that have junior college boards providing general direction to institutions with locally elected or appointed boards of trustees. In the private sector, however, the type of control (sectarian or non-sectarian) reported by the respondent was accepted without question.

TABLE 2.11

Classification of Types of Control of "New" Institutions

Classification Terms - ACE Questionnaire	Classification Terms Used in This Report				
	Public			Private	
	State	Local	Proprietary	Non-sectarian	Sectarian
Public					
State (autonomous)	X				
As part of state system:					
Branch	X				
Has separate board for this one campus	X				
Operates directly under a board governing several universities	X				
District		X			
City		X			
Other (specify)[a]	X	X			
Private					
Incorporated for profit			X		
Non-profit:					
Non-church related				X	
Church related					X

[a] Institutions that checked "Other" on the questionnaire may be classified as either state or local in this report, depending on the details provided in the questionnaire.

Table 2.12 shows the 552 new institutions that returned usable questionnaires by type of institution and control. (Incidently, most of the following statistical analyses are based on data obtained from these 552 institutions.) Approximately two-thirds of the new institutions are public. In the two-year sector, the proportion of public institutions increases to four-fifths, whereas in the four-year college category, by far the largest number is private. Among postbaccalaureate institutions, the public/private split is about equal. Public two-year colleges are the largest single category shown in the control/type of institution matrix, accounting for more than half of all the institutions in the study.

TABLE 2.12

"New" Institutions from 1947 to 1967, by Control and Type

Control	All Institutions		Type					
			2-Year		4-Year		Postbaccalaureate	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Public . . .	361	65	311	81	14	14	36	51
Private . . .	191	35	71	19	86	86	34	49
Total	552	100	382	100	100	100	70	100

Table 2.13 further breaks down control. In the public sector two-thirds of the two-year institutions are locally controlled, whereas no four-year college and only three postbaccalaureate institutions report control at that level. Table 2.13 also shows the persistence of sectarian or church-related institutions. In the private sector they account for slightly more than two-thirds of all the institutions surveyed. In each of the three types of institutions they account for more than three-fifths of the responding institutions.

For many institutions, sectarian ties are no doubt less restrictive now than in the past, and there is a trend toward appointing lay membership to sectarian boards of control, including even the appointment of laymen who do not belong to the particular denomination.

The existence of private institutions operating for profit should be noted. A number of vocationally oriented and special-purpose institutions operate in this manner. However, those colleges which are conventionally tagged as "mainstream" are not-for-profit.

TABLE 2.13

"New" Institutions from 1947 to 1967, by Type and Control

Control	All Institutions		2-Year		4-Year		Postbaccalaureate	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Public, Total . .	361	100	311	100	14	100	36	100
State	150	42	103	33	14	100	33	92
Local	211	58	208	67	-	-	3	8
Private, Total. .	191	100	71	100	86	100	34	100
Non-profit T'l.	187	98	68	96	86	100	33	97
Nonsectarian. .	56	29	20	28	24	28	12	35
Sectarian .	131	69	48	68	62	72	21	62
Proprietary . .	4	2	3	4	-	-	1	3

Enrollment

The size of a college is usually figured as the number of students enrolled. Enrollment is both an indicator of demand and of the magnitude of institutional management and development. How many students, then, have been enrolled in the new institutions?

The USOE data can provide only estimates. As noted previously, an institution may be in existence for a number of years before it appears in the USOE directory. Whereas it is possible to correct the founding dates by checking other sources, the enrollment figures are another matter. Between the time of its opening and its first directory appearance, an institution may have doubled or tripled its original enrollment, and there are no USOE reports to document this growth. The simple totaling of enrollment figures from the directories produces figures that are considerably higher than the actual first year enrollments. The estimates shown in table 2.14 result from adjustments made to the USOE directory totals based on a comparison of the first-year enrollment figures from the ACE questionnaires with the directory information for the same institutions. (See table 2.14.)

So much for the total enrollments and growth of all new colleges and universities, according to the data contained in the USOE directories. In the ACE sample, 552 new institutions are small. Some of the public community colleges, however, have opened to more than 1,000 students and have experienced phenomenally rapid growth.

TABLE 2.14

Initial Enrollment at "New" Institutions
By Type of Institution and Year of First Appearance in
USOE Directory, 1947-48 to 1970-71

Year Institution First Appeared in Directory	Number of Students		
	All Institutions	2-Year Insts.	4-Year Insts.
1947-48 -- 1950-51	46,448	36,765	9,683
1951-52 -- 1955-56	44,119	24,689	19,430
1956-57 -- 1960-61	34,707	19,145	15,562
1961-62 -- 1965-66	81,532	52,099	29,433
1966-67 -- 1970-71	429,334	322,776	106,558

Table 2.15 shows the percentage distribution of the new institutions by four size ranges according to their 1967 opening fall enrollments.[1] The ranges are those used by Harold L. Hodgkinson in his Carnegie Commission sponsored study, Institutions in Transition (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1970).[2]

Three-fifths of the new institutions fall into the "small" category and one-third are classified as "medium sized." Only 7 percent are in the two largest categories. Whereas 7 percent of the two-year institutions fall into the "large" and "giant" classes, more than one-fifth of the postbaccalaureate institutions are so classified. Absolute numbers rather than

[1] The U.S. Office of Education Opening Fall Enrollment figures for 1967 were used instead of data from the ACE questionnaires because of conflicting or inconsistent data on a sizable number of the questionnaires. Furthermore, the ACE questionnaire did not specify "degree credit" or "nondegree credit" enrollment. The USOE questionnaires in 1967 requested total (degree and nondegree credit) enrollments, defined the terms and submitted the data to considerably more checks of consistency than was possible for the ACE figures.

[2] Hodgkinson identified a fifth size, "super" (25,000 and over). None of the responding institutions fell into that category.

percentages show half again as many two-year colleges as postbaccalaureate institutions in the "large" and "giant" categories.

Table 2.15 also shows a considerable difference in the size of new private and public institutions. The great majority of the new private institutions in the sample opened to fewer than 1,000 students. Even by 1967, seven-eighths enrolled fewer than 1,000 and only five had more than 3,000 students. In contrast, although many public institutions opened with fewer than 1,000 students, in 1967 less than half were in that category and a full two-fifths had enrollments of between 1,000 and 5,000 students. Fifteen reported enrollments in excess of 10,000.

TABLE 2.15

"New" Institutions by Size, Type, and Control, Fall 1967

Key: Small = Less than 1,000; Medium = 1,000 - 4,999; Large = 5,000 - 14,999; Giant = 15,000 - 24,999

	Percentage of "New" Institutions			
Size	Total	2-Year	4-Year	Postbaccalaureate
All Institutions	100	100	100	100
Small	60	58	73	54
Medium	32	36	26	24
Large	6	6	1	16
Giant	1	1	-	6
Public	100	100	100	100
Small	45	49	14	25
Medium	43	43	79	36
Large	9	7	7	28
Giant	2	1	-	11
Private	100	100	100	100
Small	88	96	83	85
Medium	12	4	17	12
Large	1	-	-	3
Giant	-	-	-	-

Commuters and Residents

It is generally recognized that commuter colleges and universities are different from residential institutions. They are dissimilar in student heterogeneity and quality, admissions standards, costs, prestige, collegial and political life, academic atmosphere, faculty-student relationships and in many other respects. They also differ in their requirements (housing, dining facilities, parking, location, athletics, etc.) and in their management. For most purposes, an institution is classified as residential, rather than commuter, if more than half of its full-time students live on campus.

Far less than half of the students enrolled at the survey institutions lived in campus housing, both during the institutions' first year of classes and in 1967, the two dates for which housing data were gathered. Table 2.16 shows the percentages of students living in campus housing by type and control of institution. The proportion of students living on campus at private colleges is significantly greater than that at public institutions. Public four-year colleges and public and private postbaccalaureate institutions show slight increases in the proportion of students living on campus. Private two-year and four-year institutions show just the reverse; a smaller proportion of students lived in campus housing in 1967 than in the institutions' first year of classes. Of course, the number of students housed has increased in every institutional category because of enrollment increases. As one would expect, the percentage of public junior college students living on campus is very small.

Few public institutions fit the definition of "residential institution" as stated earlier. Only seven reported accommodating 50 percent or more of their students in their first year of classes. A total of

eight out of the 361 public institutions met the standard for "residential" in 1967. In the private sector there are more than ten times as many residential institutions. In their first year of classes, seventy-seven (40 percent) of the institutions reported half or more of their students using campus housing. By 1967 the number had increased slightly to eighty-one institutions or 42 percent of the private colleges included in the study.

TABLE 2.16

Percentage of Students Housed On Campus in First Year of Classes and 1967 by Type and Control of Institution

Year	Percentage of Students Housed On Campus							
	Institutions		2- Year		4-Year		Postbac-calaureate	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
First Year of Classes ...	1	45	1	39	9	58	3	26
1967	3	41	1	35	13	48	8	29

Chapter III

GETTING STARTED

The American landscape is dotted with hundreds of campuses whose reasons for being are varied and numerous. Sectarian groups, for example, have vied with one another in multiplying institutions intended primarily to spread and strengthen their faiths among the young while also providing them with opportunities for advanced education. Men of wealth have simultaneously disposed of their estates and perpetuated family names by founding colleges and universities. Sensing the economic as well as cultural advantages collegiate enterprises normally bring to communities, all kinds of local interest groups have banded together to promote such endeavors, at local or state expense. In other circumstances, individuals and groups removed from the location where a college or university eventually was established made the decisions which determined the site as well as the character of the institution.

In all of these and other instances, however, the institution begins as an idea. In all instances there is presumably some examination of the practicality or feasibility of the idea, and possibly a modification of its original form. At some juncture the idea must be legitimated through chartering. Resources have to be marshalled to translate it into action and accomplishment. Planning and programming, whether well done or badly done, need to be carried out.

Studying Feasibility

Asked to enumerate the three or four most important considerations which should be carefully reviewed by a committee or a board intending to create a new institution, the presidents of our new institutions responded as shown in table 3.1. There are nine major factors in feasibility, nine problematic topics which should check out favorably before the decision is made to go ahead with the creation of a new institution.

TABLE 3.1

Presidents' Rating of Most Important Considerations in Deciding to Create a New Institution by Type of Institution

	Presidents' Responses (Percentage)		
Consideration	2-Year	4-Year	Postbaccalaureate
Financing assured.	59	66	56
Sound planning program . .	45	50	56
Demand for educational offering	36	40	30
Qualified faculty	29	38	33
Competent administration .	31	21	30
Students available	22	24	18
Community acceptance . . .	25	13	14
Physical facilities . . .	20	18	25
Board support.	9	13	11

Presidents of all three types of institutions most frequently listed "assured financing" as one of the three most important considerations. Next in frequency of mention and importance was a "sound planning program," followed by a genuine demand and desire -- not just a projected "need" -- for the educational service being considered. The six other factors though less frequently cited are nonetheless critical. Together with the first three, they tend to comprise a whole, each factor so interdependent with every other that a failure or change in any part stands to affect the whole. For example, the item "students available," though it ranks about sixth, is closely related to the third item "demand for educational offering."

If a qualified faculty cannot be recruited, it goes without saying that the educational service will suffer. Nor would one expect sound planning or assured financing without competent administration. The availability of physical facilities of some kind is indispensible. And lacking the support of an influential board, or at least a degree of acceptance by a community with resources, net feasibility is most unlikely.

The feasibility study is more than a judgmental exercise by wise men around a conference table. Facts are needed in order to evaluate the nine factors enumerated in table 3.1 -- or on another list very much like that. Usually such a study can be done in four to six months by two or three analysts and a clerk-stenographer. It may be expected to cost somewhere between $40,000 and $60,000. Although the methods of asking the right questions and collecting, analyzing and presenting the pertinent information are somewhat technical matters, a feasibility study is no more difficult than a market analysis, which in fact it resembles. The more accessible and dependable the economic and population statistics for the proposed service area, the less difficult and costly the job will be. Census and sample survey data collected by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, by business firms, by social agencies, or by agencies of state and local government can often be readily adapted. The larger cities and metropolitan areas have local committees of statisticians constituted to assist the Bureau of the Census with their "Tract" statistics and definitions. They can be of great help. Where there are state or regional planning commissions for education both data and technical services may be available to local districts and groups.

A feasibility study can proceed from the question "who needs what kinds of postsecondary education here?" Or, with a new institution already in mind -- the nature of its services, type, size and financing visualized -- a feasibility study can determine what constitutes "the baseless fabric of this vision." For each educational program one may ask how many potential students in the age groups seventeen to twenty-one, twenty-one to twenty-three, etc., are there now in a radius of twenty to thirty to fifty miles of one or more locations, and how many will there be in five to ten to twenty years? What do they want? What will they want educationally? What are their qualifications and limitations? What can they afford? Who will foot the bills beyond tuition income that is seldom enough to finance a college? What are the economic and migration trends within the projected service area in the region and in the state that are affecting the distribution of students, of employers, of donors, of tax base? What effect will birthrates and deathrates have?

Another question for feasibility determination as well as detailed planning later is this: What is happening to the occupational structure of the projected college's service area? What are the job requirements now and how are they changing? What skills are in short supply and which trades, crafts, and vocations are in demand by students or potential students? The American technological apparatus generally is changing quite rapidly and the skills taught yesterday may be outmoded tomorrow, as table 3.2 shows in terms of the discrepancies between enrollments and needs.

TABLE 3.2

Enrollments and Needs in the Major Fields of Vocational Education in the United States

Vocational Fields	1967 Enrollments (In thousands)	1967 Enrollments Percentage	1967-1975 Manpower Needs Percentage
Trades and industry	491	12	33
Office skills	1,178	29	29
Distributive education	172	4	12
Management and supervisory	-	-	10
Health fields	71	2	7
Home economics	1,479	37	6
Technical education	125	3	2
Agriculture education	517	13	1
Total	4,033	100	100

SOURCES: U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare, Annual Report on Vocational and Technical Education, Fiscal Year 1967, and "Estimates of Vocational Education Requirements Based upon General Learning Corporation Model," a paper by James Nussbaum and William Morsch prepared for Ohio State University conference, June 12-13, 1968. Enrollments are for secondary and postsecondary education. Manpower needs are estimates.

The nature of an area's occupational structure, of course, is closely related to another matter which feasibility analysts must determine: the social class structure. There is evidence that many of the children of middle and upper class families today are rejecting the occupational slots and careers for which their parents would formerly have ticketed them. Middle class sons and daughters in ever greater numbers since 1964 have dropped from the bureaucratic and professional career ladders on which their families would customarily have placed them. But their places do not go unfilled. Increasingly, it seems, the children of blue-collar families and those from the impoverished and unemployed under-class are taking the places of the middle class dropouts by taking advantage of accessible postsecondary educational opportunities. The big city community

college with an open-door admissions policy but with some members of its faculty and its public fearing that low-ability students will destroy academic "standards" is in the middle of what may be a revolutionary change in the recruitment and replenishment of America's elites. At the same time there is the question of what to do with the one-time dropout or drop-down who seeks a second chance. Are such people part of the student market, and if so how are their needs best met?

Next, the feasibility determination should analyze the competition for students and for faculty and staff. Will the service area of the projected institution support still another institution? Will it do so at a level that will permit quality performance? Surely, no more third-rate institutions are necessary, even if new ones could survive, which becomes increasingly doubtful. Thus, the question of viability of new or alternative services, namely, what may be an oligopoly of already established institutions, becomes critical.

Assuming there exist assured financing, plenty of students, and an ample supply of faculty and staff -- assuming indeed that all nine factors in table 3.1 can be met -- what then? An important question remains that is seldom posed in the founders' characteristic eagerness to move ahead.

Is A New Institution Necessary?

Before announcing a founding decision that will inevitably entail a lengthy and complex series of actions and commitments, the would-be founders should pause to consider whether a wholly new institution is really needed. Only if the following questions can be answered in the negative should the venture proceed: (1) Is there an existing organization

or institution which could conceivably serve the demand that exists? (2) Is there an existing institution that could provide the locus and the corporate structure for what is desired? (3) Is the demand which is evident now likely to slacken or disappear in a few years? (4) Is there another source of leadership or entrepreneurship that could be compelled or persuaded to found this institution? (5) Could the demand be met by making an unconventional use of a non-educational organization -- for example, an industry or a business?

New colleges and universities, after all, are not the only organizations that can and do provide education and training. There are already hundreds of special purpose educational programs operated by non-collegiate institutions. If one only wants to learn a language, for example, he can attend an intensive training course at a proprietary center that will practically guarantee success at any of several levels of competence. No degree or certificate may be offered or needed. Similarly, advanced instruction is available through proprietary institutions in fields such as electronics, computer programming, plastic manufacturing, shorthand, accounting, automobile driving, swimming, cooking, hotel management, speed reading, music, art, photography, automobile repairing, creative writing, and a whole range of liberal and humane arts, skills and technologies. It is no exaggeration to say that much of the subject matter of a four-year college curriculum could be mastered by using commercial, proprietary colleges and correspondence schools. Those who would build a conventional college should consider carefully whether the needs of the market they have identified could be met through adaptations of existing organizations. Many colleges and universities now subcontract their housing, food, and laundry services to private entrepreneurs. Is

there any reason why they might not do the same thing, for example, with basic instruction in foreign languages, reading or English grammar, and data processing? Some secondary school systems have recently begun doing just this.

The possibilities of adapting, expanding or otherwise changing already established colleges and universities are no less challenging than starting new ones and should also be appraised carefully.

Making It Legal

Once the prospective founders have established the feasibility and the necessity for a new institution, a legal charter is probably necessary before going much further. Though it is possible for private persons, unlike public agencies or government officials, to establish a partnership or an informal association, there are so many advantages to incorporating and acquiring a charter that this is almost always done. The advantages are these. First, the individual members of the committee or group who draw up a charter -- they are usually called trustees or, sometimes, directors -- are not personally liable for the debts or other obligations of their incorporated college. Second, the corporate institution, enjoying the legal fiction of corporate personality, has its own legal life which can endure beyond the death, departure, or disinterest of its individual members, including the trustees. Third, financial donors are inclined to place more confidence in a corporate institution, and they can also anticipate certain tax advantages. Fourth, the state controls over corporations guarantee that new corporate institutions will be open to public scrutiny for the most part at least, and that they will conform to laws designed to protect the public interest. Finally, a chartered corporation itself, whether for profit or not, can usually enjoy some tax advantages, particularly during its early years.

Private citizens to whom a charter is granted are expected under the law to discharge certain responsibilities and to exercise specified powers for the benefit of others. Thus, the trustees of a college are legally responsible for assuring that the institution fulfills the distinctive purposes for which it was established. However, the public custodianship of college and university trustees is seldom examined as carefully as that of the directors of banks. For higher education there seems to be no parallel to state banking commissions and federal banking agencies. The regional accrediting associations are certainly not, for they do not require that board members attend meetings, personally examine periodic performance reports, or measure up to declared standards of experience and character before their institution is chartered or before they are appointed.

In most states the college or university charter is a document. It may also be a matter of special legislation that specifies the purposes for which the corporation has been established and that enumerates the general powers which it may use, e.g. to receive property and gifts, employ personnel, spend money, contract obligations, hold securities, and so forth. Usually it is each secretary of state who grants or certifies charters. No two states are alike in their conditions and provisions, and the assistance of a qualified lawyer, preferably not one of the founders, is advised. It is important to remember that almost all charters grant powers <u>to the trustees</u> but leave the selection and delegation of powers to the trustees themselves.

Wide variations in requirements for establishing new colleges and universities in the United States are described in a study of the state

laws by Robert L. Williams.[3] Williams deals only with the formality of a state charter, a formality that is important. He summarizes the conditions to be met in the fifty states if a group is to establish and operate a college or university that confers degrees, diplomas or other honors on its students. There are three types of legislation identified. In twenty-three states the statutes specifically describe the establishment of private nontax-supported educational institutions of higher education. In eleven states the same statutes apply which generally govern the establishment of nonprofit corporations or associations. In sixteen states the statutes governing the establishment of nonprofit corporations apply, but with additional legislation also pertaining to educational institutions.

In early 1970 there was no state control except charter formalities in establishing new private institutions of higher education in thirty states. For four-year public institutions in thirty-eight states approval by the legislature is necessary, and in twenty-eight of those states prior approval or recommendation by the state coordinating or governing body is required. For two-year public institutions thirty-nine of the states required approval by a state agency. Tables 3.3 and 3.4 summarize the legalities of establishment and of offering new degrees and programs.

---

[3] Robert L. Williams, "Legal Bases for Establishment of Private Institutions of Higher Education." North Central Association Quarterly, Winter 1970, pp. 291-298.

TABLE 3.3

Authority for Establishing New Institutions of Higher Education in the Fifty States and the District of Columbia (In Numbers of States)

Authority	New Institutions			
	Public		Private	
	4-Yr.	2-Yr.	Nonprofit	Proprietary
Final approval source:				
Legislature	38	20	4	4
State governing or coordinating agency	10	12	9	6
Other	3	18	7	9
Prior approval and recommendation by governing or coordinating agency	28	19	3	3
No state control	-	-	30	30
Formal criteria determined by:				
State agency	33	28	12	10
Other	4	13	5	7
None	13	9	33	33

SOURCE: Higher Education in the States, Vol. 1, No. 2, March 1970. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States.

For private institutions seeking to establish new degrees and programs some kind of state sanction was necessary in only nine states. In the remaining forty-one states the institutions' governing boards could do as they wished within the broad and permissive formalities of their charter and articles of incorporation.

TABLE 3.4

Authority for Approving New Degrees and Programs at Institutions of Higher Education in the Fifty States and the District of Columbia[a]
(In Numbers of States)

Authority	Public Institutions			Private Institutions
	New Degrees at 4-Yr. Ins.	New Programs at 4-Yr.	New Programs at 2-Yr.	(New Programs and/or Degrees)
State governing or coordinating agency	36	34	24	6
Institution's governing board (or institution president)	14	14	9	43
Legislature	3	2	1	1
Other state agency[b]	3	3	19	3
Reviewed or recommended by appropriate state agency . . .	5	5	5	-

SOURCE: Higher Education in the States, Vol. 1, No. 2, March 1970. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States.

[a] Figures will not always add to a total of 51 because in some states more than one source of final approval is required, or responsibility is divided (i.e., one source for undergraduate, one for graduate).

[b] For example, state boards for junior or community colleges, state boards of education, chief state school officers, etc.

With tighter tax laws for nonprofit corporations, and with more public attention focused on abuses for private gain by some nonprofit organizations, the founders of new institutions should look not only to the potentials of their institutions, but also to the possibility that sometime they may want to close the institutions. Closing an insti-

tution involves more than just closing the door and departing. Many states require the charter to specify what is to be done with the assets of the corporation if it disbands. And many states require formal dissolution, including specific schedules for the disposition of assets. The uses to which the assets may be put in such instances are frequently restricted.

A charter may be amended, but in most cases this is not easily done. It is much simpler to amend the bylaws that trustees are authorized to devise and adopt. The best rule here seems to be to emulate the authors of the Constitution of the United States. That is, make the basic document as brief and as general as possible, and leave the rest to the legislative process. For colleges this means that the drafting of bylaws and administrative regulations is better entrusted to the faculty, administration, board, and students instead of being spelled out in the charter.

Planning and Programming

These are some of the basic steps in the establishment of a new institution:

. . . Compose and appoint a competent and supportive board of trustees.

. . . Give a name to the institution and get a charter for it.

. . . Find a suitable site.

. . . Raise funds and plan the construction or rehabilitation of the necessary buildings and physical plant within an acceptable site plan.

. . . Raise funds for the operation and general educational expenses for the first several years when tuition and other sources of income are likely to be minimal.

. . . Employ a qualified president and other senior management officers.

. . . Design and staff a curriculum with several educational programs and objectives.

. . . Organize and involve a qualified faculty committed to the goals of the institution.

. . . Attract and create a proper learning environment for a student body of optimal size and characteristics for the institution's mission.

. . . Construct or remodel buildings.

. . . Devise bylaws, procedures, regulations for students, faculty, administration, and board.

. . . Coordinate institutional development with related undertakings in the community, region, and nation.

Making Performance Predictable

These and other jobs are best accomplished by adhering to a carefully planned schedule where responsibilities are assigned to particular people and groups, with target dates set for completion and the necessary resources allocated. In other words, they must be planned, programmed and budgeted. Then, performances must be analyzed periodically to determine accomplishments and to spot operational problems as a basis for improved planning, programming and budgeting. This kind of "program budgeting" or "target budgeting" has become a prime ingredient in many of the complex undertakings of government and industry, and there is no reason it should not be used more extensively in higher education.

The introduction of a program budgeting system is sometimes perceived as threatening and disruptive, especially in colleges and universities that are well established. If the institution is only beginning, however, and if its planning involves representatives of the relevant power groups in explaining the goals and rationale which makes program budgeting the means to ends that are widely accepted and sought, there should be little trouble. It is planning that is the indispensable first step toward such a system.

Planning is sometimes described as long-range, middle-range, and short-range. For purposes of this study, planning is long-range activity and programming is middle-or short-range. The advantage of the programming concept is that it emphasizes actions and activities derived from longer range planning. But it is planning which gives programming its meaning and its broad goals, its larger justification, and the ultimate criteria, therefore, by which it is judged. The first step in establishing the overall goals and objectives of a college or university is the development of a long-range plan. While it is true that planning can be highly abstract and rarefied this is not what modern management doctrine would define as good planning.

Planning is a Process

Why should this college or university be established? To what extent can its purposes be achieved? Will this institution be flexible enough to meet the demands of an uncertain future?

Harry Williams has answered such questions in concrete terms, as for example:

> The university will serve undergraduate, graduate, and public service requirements in a ratio of effort approximating 5:2:1.
>
> Total enrollment will be expanded to a level of 10,000 students over the next ten years.
>
> Faculty will be expanded to achieve a 1:15 faculty-student ratio with a teaching-research ratio of 2:1.
>
> The major program emphases will continue to be in Letters and Sciences, with a gradual phase-out of professional schools.[4]

[4] Harry Williams, Planning for Effective Resource Allocation in Universities (Washington: American Council on Education, 1966), pp. 34-35.

Programming and budgeting are frequently listed as elements of a planning process. For example, in a paper that states the case for good planning (defined as a "realistic look at where your institution is in the setting of personal goals which are manageable"), Alvin C. Eurick lists six elements essential to "an adequate plan." These are:

1. A description of the college as it now exists;
2. A clear statement of the goals of an institution which restricts its functions and does not promise to do all things for all students;
3. A set of assumptions for the future;
4. A projection of an educational program with methods for carrying it out and evaluating it regularly;
5. A statement of financial requirements to carry out the plan;
6. A provision for an adequate and regular accounting to the constituency of the college on how well or poorly the institution is doing in carrying out the plan.[5]

For the purpose of this study, Items 1, 2, and 3 may be designated as planning, Item 4 as programming, and Item 5 as budgeting, a subject to be considered later. Eurich's Item 6 is review and evaluation of performance, a major aspect of the program budgeting system.

Programming explicates and breaks down long-range plans and objectives into sequential activities and assigns authority, responsibility, and resources for the scheduled activities. Planning is a matter of strategy, programming one of tactics.

The details of planning and programming as they apply to college building may be found in a number of publications. For example, Selden Menefee and Jack Orcutt (Editors), in Focus on Action: A Handbook for Developing Junior Colleges (Washington: American Association of

---

5 Alvin C. Eurich, "Plan or Perish," College and University Journal, Summer 1970, pp. 18-22.

Junior Colleges, 1969) present an extensive collection of useful, brief articles, mostly from the Junior College Journal. B. Lamar Johnson's Starting A Community Junior College (Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1964) is a concise, practical manual.

The context of planning and programming is important and will differ from one type of institution and control system to another. The prospects and implications for local communities are treated by John Caffrey and Herbert H. Isaacs in Estimating the Impact of a College or University on the Local Economy (Washington: American Council on Education, 1971). The productivity and performance of colleges, and how these may be assessed, is the focus of a book edited by Ben Lawrence, George Weathersby and Virginia W. Patterson, Outputs of Higher Education: Their Identification, Measurement and Evaluation (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1970). And for the planners of two-year colleges the U.S. Office of Education has prepared a number of publications including: Patterns of Organization and Support in Public Two-Year Colleges, State Formulas for the Support of Public Two-Year Colleges, and Procedures for the Establishment of Public Two-Year Colleges.

Several states such as California, Ohio, Illinois, Florida, and New York have had considerable experience in planning public institutions. But in very few states have both private and public sectors of higher education worked in coordination to assist, guide, and control the development of both kinds of new institutions. New York is one state that does have such coordination, however, with a staff that works on advanced planning for private as well as public institutions. The staff is under the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York. Its objective has been to develop awareness of what both sectors and their institutions are planning and doing.

How do the presidents of the new campuses in New York and elsewhere feel about such activities? ACE staff interviews showed them to be uniformly in support of coordinating mechanisms. Some of the presidents even urged a tightening of requirements and a strengthening of standard planning-programming procedures.

Some of the Obstacles

Although coordinating mechanisms in many states do facilitate good planning and programming, sometimes in both sectors -- public and private-- many of the new institutions studied were poorly planned and badly programmed. One of the most common and most serious reasons cited for this was insufficient time. Most of the presidents had little or no time to plan, a finding which confirms the observation of B. Lamar Johnson. His book, Islands of Innovation Expanding (Macmillan-Glencoe, 1969, p. 293) reports that fewer than one in four presidents of junior colleges had as long as one year in which to begin operation of the institution. Two had only two months. Moreover, as data presented later show, the executive staff who should have been on hand to help the president and others with planning were either not in place at all, or were employed later than they should have been. "We developed and opened ou ollege in five months' time," said one president of a community college. Another, who urged that new institutions' time for planning always be provided, reported in the case of his own college:

> The legislature put our college in business July 1 with the request that it open its doors to classes in September of the same year. The board and the state now have to face the fact that colleges need effective planning over a period of time and in this state the new institutions just don't get it. We can't get legislators and other big wheels to recognize that staff must be available for at least one year before classes in order to do a passable job of planning.

In some places ingenuity was mustered to cope with extreme time pressures. At a Virginia technological college, for example, the staff adapted the PERT planning system (Program Evaluation Review Technique widely used in business and industry for several years) to curriculum building, developing course content, writing the catalogue, procuring faculty, and constructing and equipping the physical plant. Everybody took up PERT -- trustees, administration, and instructional staff. A description declares that, "The college was established in 84 working days after the first staff member reported, and it opened on schedule with 700 students."[6]

An illustration of planning over an extended period may be witnessed at Hampshire College in Amherst, Massachusetts. Hampshire had its beginnings in 1955 in a committee that represented the sponsoring institutions: Amherst, Mount Holyoke and Smith Colleges, and the University of Massachusetts. Numerous consultants were involved: scholars, artists, scientists, foundation officers, architects, and government officials. President Franklin K. Patterson and Vice President Charles R. Longsworth have described the founding and planning process in The Making of a College (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1967). But Hampshire had a grant of $6 million for initial development (planning included) and to cover early operational deficits as well. Whether the goal of Hampshire's founders, to demonstrate "that a private institution of academic excellence can be organized to function principally on its tuition income " will be realized, it is too soon to tell. Few institutions, particularly in the private sector, can parallel Hampshire's opportunity.

6. Robert McKey and Kathryn Jane Rapley, Documentation of Steps to Establish a Technical College (Northern Virginia Technical College, ERIC Document Ed. ED010020).

Campus visits revealed some bizarre ideas of what a plan is, and an extensive naiveté of the planning-programming process. One president pointed with pride to an elaborate brochure that described the future design of the campus, complete with alternatives depending on the rate at which enrollment grew. This was the college plan. Another produced a weighty typescript that spelled out a ten-year budget in great detail. It was predicated on trends over the past three years, with certain adjustments that reflected the intended effects of improved recruiting.

Mere possession of "a plan " is no guarantee for action or accomplishment. As one dean put it,

> Our plans are very accurate but they are not very useful as planning instruments. Our first five-year plan ... was... written at the end of the five-year period and the second five-year plan will no doubt be written at the end of the tenth year. In this case one is always talking about what happened rather than what was planned to happen.

A young president, describing his new experiences in the job, declared,

> Yes, we have a plan, I found it in the files and was somewhat mystified because it looked familiar. I dug through my own personal files and found that, indeed, it was substantially the same plan that had been used at another institution, except for changes in names and a few details.

In more than one instance, inquiry revealed that fund raisers, employed very early, had blocked realistic planning. One dean said his institution was set back two years because it used fund raisers unfamiliar with the ways educational institutions operate. The second president at one institution was working constantly to overcome the ill will created by his predecessor who had employed a fund raiser as the first staff member of the college. This avid staffer had used "the hard sell" but everybody realized that he had nothing to sell.

When the ACE survey was made in 1967, the student protest movement was gaining momentum on many campuses. Whether it was because the colleges in the sample were less politicized, because the presidents were less aware, or because they thought the customary exclusion of students in college planning was preferable, almost no president mentioned the involvement of students as participants in planning. Out of 340 statements which pertained to the substance or the process of planning, sixteen related to the design of curricula to fit students' needs, two to the identification of a student body that would fit a given curriculum, and two that specifically referred to the involvement of students in the process of planning. While little was said generally about involving other than administrators, there were thirteen specific mentions of the faculty's role, twenty-five references to consultants, and eighteen references to people from the community and from business.

The presidents also attached no great importance to the involvement of students in decisions regarding grading and academic programs. This was the case no matter whether the institution was public or private, two-year, four-year, or offering postbaccalaureate work.

The Quality of Early Planning and Development

Asked in the questionnaire to rate the importance of planning and educational programming, large majorities of the presidents at all kinds of institutions rated them "highly important." Table 3.5 shows responses which remained essentially the same when the institutions were broken down by size: 83 percent of the presidents at large institutions rated long-range continuous planning highly important, and 83 percent also rated obtaining general agreement on educational aims as highly important. At public and private institutions alike, the majority response was "highly important" too.

TABLE 3.5

Presidents' Rating of Importance of Planning by Type and Size of Institution

Problem	Presidents' Responses of "Highly Important" (%)					
	Type			Size		
	2-Year	4-Year	Postbaccalaureate	Small	Medium	Large
Long-range planning on a continuing basis	72	73	77	69	73	83
Instituting educational innovations	61	57	61	54	66	67
Obtaining general agreement on educational aims. . . .	76	78	71	75	76	83
Maintaining on campus adequate degree of independence and freedom for educational initiative and change	69	67	68	64	75	67

Asked about the difficulty of the same four general and abstract items, only a minority of presidents, usually less than a third, rated them high in difficulty (see table 3.6). Only the heads of large institutions more frequently rated difficulty high. There was no difference apparent between public and private sector. In general terms, then, planning was thought to be highly important and seldom very difficult. However, quite a different story was evident when the subject shifted from general considerations to more specific matters of actual planning and development.

TABLE 3.6

Presidents' Rating of Difficulty of Planning
by Type and Size of Institution

Problem	Presidents' Responses of "High in Difficulty" (%)					
	Type			Size		
	2-Year	4-Year	Postbaccalaureate	Small	Medium	Large
Long-range planning on a continuing basis . . .	27	30	32	29	25	46
Instituting educational innovations	27	25	30	27	29	54
Obtaining general agreement on educational aims	18	17	20	14	18	38
Maintaining on campus adequate degree of independence and freedom for educational initiative and change	14	9	18	12	13	29

The views of the presidents were solicited as to the adequacy of seventeen factors in the early development of their institution, whether or not they had been personally involved. As table 3.7 indicates, some items referred to the substance of plans and programming, whereas others referred more to the nature of the development process, that is to the people involved or to their experience. Table 3.7 shows that only four of the factors in early planning and programming had operated so well that a third or more of the presidents gave them a "highly adequate" rating. And one of these involved their own or a predecessor's involvement. It may be concluded that much of the early development work could have been better.

TABLE 3.7

Presidents' Rating of Factors in Early Development
by Type of Institution

Factors	Presidents' Reponses of "Highly Adequate" (Percentage)		
	2-Year	4-Year	Postbaccalaureate
Early involvement of the president . . .	55	54	52
Goals defined	37	39	43
Planning for campus growth	33	35	45
Communication with community leaders . .	30	21	19
Sources of financing identified... . . .	27	17	20
Comparable academic programs analyzed. .	26	31	33
Previous academic experience of the first administrative staff	23	17	26
Effective use of board members	19	21	9
Involvement of initial faculty in planning	19	31	34
Faculty that accepts goals of the institution.	18	22	10
Use of educational consultants	17	22	19
Student needs and interests reflected. .	17	17	17
Accurate prediction of student demand. .	16	10	17
Goals translated into budgets, facilities, programs	14	13	19
New educational ideas and methods considered	13	17	19
Extra-curricular activities planned. . .	11	9	14
Breadth of educational experience of board members	10	7	9

But now let us ask which factors, rated at any one point on the five-point adequacy scale, are found together most frequently? Intercorrelations were calculated for all of the seventeen items, one with the other, in order to get some idea of likely cause-and-effect relationships.

For the institutions that began classes with 500 students or more, six factors correlated highly (in excess of .4) with others. They are

listed according to the number of times (in parentheses) correlations of more than .4 were calculated for them.

Early involvement of the president (14)
Use of educational consultants (9)
Effective use of board members (8)
Previous academic experience of the first administrative staff (7)
Involvement of initial faculty in planning (6)
Breadth of educational experience of board members (1)

For the smaller colleges (enrollment less than 100), the order of occurrence of high correlations is:

Use of educational consultants (9)
Breadth of educational experience on the board (7)
Involvement of the early faculty in planning (7)
Effective use of board members (6)
Previous academic experience of the first administrators (4)
Early involvement of the president (1)

Because of the subjective character of the questions and the responses obtained, statistical significance should not be ascribed to these correlations. Nevertheless, some tendencies are evident that attract speculation. In general, the larger institutions (enrollment 500 and over) gave higher correlations among all factors than did the small ones which began with fewer than 100 students. Also the rank orders are not the same. This suggests that the best start for a small college may not be best for the large institution.

At institutions of all sizes, the effective use of board members, the use of educational consultants, and the early involvement of the first president were comparable in the relatively high number of significant correlations developed in this analysis. The academic experience of the first administrative staff, the degree of faculty involvement, and the breadth of educational experience on the board showed up in high correlations with only about half the frequency of the top three.

In spite of the subjective and retrospective character of the viewpoints, and the fact that reference is only to conditions that existed in the beginnings of the institutions, a tentative conclusion may be drawn. The data here seem to confirm a finding from other data, namely that good judgment and experience are of great value whether derived from consultants, board members, or the first president.

Building-in the Planning Function

Even when it is recognized that planning and programming are essential, and that they should be comprehensive and continuous, little more than talk and paper shuffling may take place. ACE staff visits and interviews at many places revealed tendencies to establish committees and then regard this as prime action or accomplishment. There must be staff and the staff must include the kind of person "who can make an idea walk," as Felix Frankfurter said.

The key man in creating an effective planning process is the president. Until he is on the scene no new institution can move far beyond the preliminaries of formulating and testing the founding idea, getting a charter and the like. As a rule, it takes time to get a first president. It takes time to work up the specifications and requirements. It takes time to assemble a list of qualified people apart from just interested applicants. It takes time to contact, interview, assess. It takes time to hire the best man available. And then it takes time for him to move into the new job. Altogether, president-seekers can count on at least six months to one year to get their man.

It is the responsibility of the president to build in and "institutionalize" the planning, programming -- and budgeting -- process or system.

This is so not merely because he is the chief executive, but also because effective planning and programming are his best means of exerting leadership. Therefore, by establishing a competent and suitable staff for analysis and planning, the prudent president can avoid or minimize allegations that he has delusions of grandeur. And he will be able to give more than custodial care through leadership that elicits the best from others throughout the organization.

It is in the president's office that most of the concerns of the institution converge: concerns of its operational units, its disciplines, specialties, and sectors. The real genius of his leadership can be manifested in the way he organizes for planning, in the way he groups individuals from different units of the institution in some lateral mechanism that cuts across academic disciplines, schools, departments or service divisions of the institution.

Treating planning as a process is but one more illustration of the concept that a college or university is a dynamic organization. It is subjected to forces from within and without that are always changing their intensity and direction. Planning and programming, if they can be built in from the start, should prevent excessive institutional rigidity and facilitiate renewal and make the difference between survival and extinction, good and bad performance.

Chapter IV

THE EDUCATIONAL COMPOSITE

> Generally institutions don't pay enough attention to their purposes. And when they do they almost always come up with high-minded but unrealistic talk about excellence, vast needs, or new frontiers. They seldom link what they say with what they do. And they have a hard time enlisting teachers, students, and administrators in a shared enterprise.
>
> ----- (from an interview with a president)

Institutional purposes, programs, students, and faculty may be regarded here as making up the educational composite. Although these elements are all interactive, neither the questionnaire nor the interviews directed respondents' attention to the interrelationship of the elements, and hence our summary will have to deal with each element independently.

Purposes

There was considerable confusion with respect to major goals in some of the institutions studied. For example, one president complained that his campus was intended to be a technical institute, but that from the start more than 80 percent of the students were in liberal arts fields. Another president said that he had searched the files and conferred at length with board members in the hope of finding an explicit statement of institutional purpose, and had been unsuccessful. A private college which was advertised as highly experimental had a board whose goals were focused in one direction and a faculty in another. At a new state university,

faculty members were dismayed by the board's early decision to launch an intercollegiate athletic program before any serious thought had been given to academic goals.

Three-quarters of the presidents responding to the survey questionnaire regarded obtaining general agreement on educational aims as highly important but not very difficult (see tables 3.5 and 3.6). About a third of them, however, thought the adequacy of initial goal definition was just "passable" or "low."

Programs

On questionnaire items regarding programs, the data sustain the generalization that it is difficult to make educational programs match institutional purposes, and even more difficult to operate programs to serve the genuine needs of students. Five questionnaire items relate definitely to educational programming; as previously note in table 3.7, the presidents were asked to rate the adequacy of these items along with a number of others. The five educational program items are singled out for special attention in table 4.1 with emphasis on "passable" and "low" adequacy responses.

TABLE 4.1

Presidents' Rating of Handling of Educational Program Problems in Early Development of "New" Institutions, by Type of Institution

Problem	Presidents' Responses of "Passable" and "Low" (Percentage)		
	2-Year	4-Year	Postbaccalaureate
Defining purposes or goals	32	31	35
Translating stated goals into programs, budgets, staff, facilities . . .	49	54	51
Analyzing comparable academic programs already in the region . .	39	48	38
Involving first group of faculty in program planning, setting degree requirements and standards	52	41	31
Using experienced educational consultants	58	60	69

Defining purposes or goals fared better than the other items in table 4.1, evidence perhaps that however difficult defining purposes may be, it is usually simpler than implementing them. Analyzing other institutional programs in the same geographical area was next with ratings of 39 percent, 48 percent, and 38 percent in the two-year colleges, four-year colleges, and postbaccalaureate institutions respectively. The use of experienced educational consultants, was handled least adequately, especially at the postbaccalaureate institutions. The other two items with the lowest adequacy ratings, translating stated goals and involving the first group of faculty, testify to the difficulty of translating goals into programs through implementation. There is evidence as well of the difficulty, especially at the two-year colleges, in getting faculty

cooperation in program planning and setting approprate academic standards and requirements.

The questionnaire did not deal with two issues of program and purpose that figured prominently in many of the conversations with new college builders: (1) How can humanistic studies be given greater meaning and pertinence in the lives of poor and disadvantaged students as well as "overadvantaged" and those alienated from the middle classes, and (2) Can a new work ethic grow out of a better fusion of vocational skills and abstract knowledge? One community college educator thought that the usual pattern of first providing general education for students and then offering them specialization is unsound pedagogically. He argued:

> This is responsible for the major problems in community college education. What we need to do is make vocational training and general education go forward side by side for the student, keeping the doors of opportunity open in both academic and vocational directions. When this was done in a few places, it was learned that much larger numbers of students can profit from higher education than first thought. This in turn makes it possible to extend economic opportunities to more and more people.

To charges that career training, if it becomes primary or coequal with general education, would be dangerous vocationalism, another community college president insisted this was nonsense.

> Such condemnations of community college training and vocational emphases are wrong-headed, snobbish, and irresponsible. The fact is that both the disadvantaged and the privileged in very great numbers these days want to feel the dignity of honest worth in their work. They want a scope for progress that turns a job into a career. It seems to me that a great number of our students today reject our old values because they don't know what it is they contribute to the system or what it is they can do well in it. The importance of the career emphasis in education is far more than a matter of wanting people equipped for jobs so they will not go on relief rolls. People need self-respect and this is the basis of all public

> and private virtues. Function means more than money. And our social flareups should have taught us that it is not enough to just raise pay scales for dead end jobs or to increase welfare payments to satisfy the disadvantaged. At the other end of the economic scale it isn't enough either to tell a talented and idealistic young person that the work he regards as socially meaningless or harmful pays well or will offer him security. They aren't interested in that anymore.

Accreditation

For all but the adventurous few, accreditation is a necessity of life for new colleges and universities. This feature of American education, according to the U.S. Office of Education in its annual Education Directory, implies a "voluntary self-evaluation by a school and appraisal by a group of its peers." The accreditation process is operated through state bodies, regional groups, and nationally recognized accrediting agencies and associations. These agencies and associations establish their own criteria and objectives with a view presumably toward maintaining educational quality and stimulating improvement. The USOE describes the accrediting procedure as consisting of five steps:

1. Establishment of criteria.
2. Preparation of a self-evaluation study by the institution or the program seeking accreditation.
3. Evaluation of the institution by competent authorities to determine whether it meets the established criteria.
4. Publication of a list of institutions that meet the criteria.
5. Periodic reviews to ascertain whether accredited institutions continue to meet the criteria.

Institutions that are accepted by an accrediting agency or association as meeting its criteria are said to accredited or approved.

For educational programs in the liberal arts and general categories and sometimes for special programs as well, there are six regional accrediting associations: Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary

Schools, Commission on Higher Education; New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education; North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education; Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools, Commission on Higher Schools; Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges; Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities, and Accrediting Commission for Junior Colleges. Besides the six regional associations listed above, there are numerous associations which accredit professional and specialized schools and programs, and sometimes there are two for a single specialty.

For a new institution seeking regional accreditation, there are two preliminary stages: "correspondent" and "recognized candidate for accreditation." The professional accrediting agencies have different nomenclatures by which they indicate reactions to a new institution's ability to achieve accreditation within a reasonable time.

That there is a considerable lag between the year a new institution opens its doors and the year it can expect and actually get accreditation is evident in table 4.2.

TABLE 4.2

Number and Percentage Distribution of "New" Institutions, by Year of Accreditation and Year of First Instruction, from 1947 to 1967

Year of First Instruction	Total	Year of Accreditation					Accredited through Parent Inst.	Not Accredited
		1947-50	1951-55	1956-60	1961-65	1966-67		
		Number of Institutions						
1947-50	59	1	11	16	7	6	4	14
1951-55	56	-	1	9	10	4	5	27
1956-60	110	-	-	7	26	10	28	39
1961-65	202	-	-	-	20	31	20	131
1966-67	125	-	-	-	-	6	15	104
Total	552	1	12	32	63	57	72	315
		Percentage Distribution						
1947-50	100	2	18	27	12	10	7	24
1951-55	100	-	2	16	18	7	9	48
1956-60	100	-	-	6	24	9	25	36
1961-65	100	-	-	-	10	15	10	65
1966-67	100	-	-	-	-	5	12	83
Total	100	-	2	6	12	10	13	57

Over half of the institutions responding to the ACE questionnaire had not been accredited by 1967 (see table 4.2). This may not be too surprising since many of the respondents offered their first classes in the mid-sixties and therefore did not have much time to prepare for the accrediting teams. What is revealing is that nearly one-quarter of the institutions begun in the period from 1947 to 1950 and nearly half of those begun in the following quinquennium (1951-55) had not been accredited by 1967. In all likelihood, these percentages are somewhat lower than they would be if all of the institutions established in those time periods had responded, for one may expect a higher percentage of the nonaccredited institutions among the nonrespondents.

Looking at the percentage of institutions accredited in the same five-year period as their establishment, institutions beginning in the period from 1956 to 1960 or later have a better record than those established

earlier. Six percent of the institutions begun in the period from 1956 to 1960, 10 percent of the institutions begun in the period from 1961 to 1965, and 5 percent of those begun in the two-year period from 1966 to 1967 were accredited in the time period in which they first offered classes. More institutions are being accredited more rapidly now than twenty years ago, so that procedural delays formerly resulting in an "accreditation gap" have been partially eliminated.

It should be noted that none of the colleges and universities surveyed were "correspondence schools," although several offered or planned to offer "external degrees," i.e., programs given off campus or at dispersed learning centers.

But what of the accreditation gap still present in this sample of new institutions? What does it mean? There is no reason to believe that they are so commonly unconventional or innovative that their accreditation comes hard. Nor is there evidence that on the whole -- accredited and nonaccredited -- their academic facilities are inferior to those of older accredited institutions. On the contrary, as table 4.3 indicates, the general picture is quite traditional. Table 4.3 deals only with requirements for graduation with baccalaureate degree, and shows the distribution of responses from four-year colleges only. Two-year institutions were automatically eliminated and, because many of the postbaccalaureate institutions were special purpose institutions such as schools of theology, their reponses were also excluded.

TABLE 4.3

Selected Credit Regulations (Percentage Distribution Allowed at Responding Four-Year Institutions)

Credit Regulation	Percentage That Allow: Less than 10%	10-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-75%	Over 75%	Percentage of 4-Year Insts. in ACE Sample Responding
Credit hours or equivalent which are:								
Allowable in honors program . . .	65	14	6	2	4	8	2	51
Allowable by examination	68	14	3	-	4	3	9	74
Open to elective by student. . .	6	47	24	10	5	7	1	83
Required in major field.	-	6	67	20	2	4	-	83
Transferable from other institutions .	-	4	5	4	32	50	6	82

Size and other Factors

How big should a college be? This question makes sense only if one knows the purposes of a college and whom and how it will educate. In other words, until the institution's purposes and programs are clearly visualized, the question of optimal size is premature. Optimum size should also hinge upon the quality of student-faculty relationships sought for the college, as well as the kind of financial and managerial structure desired or directed. Several economists have concluded that liberal arts colleges need at least 1000 students to operate at a moderate cost per student. The most economic size, they say, is between 1500 and 2000, but economies of scale (larger classes) are more likely with about 2000 students. When enrollment enters the 2500-5000 range, the needs for office and laboratory space increase significantly. Space needs mount significantly again when

enrollment reaches the 5000-10,000 range. Donald Reichard, in a review of research on size, has concluded,

> This suggests that higher education institutions have found it uneconomical to offer extensive science programs unless enrollment exceeds a minimum of 2500 students. Whether additional economies of scale with regard to laboratory facilities are also achieved when enrollment reaches 5000 and even heavier commitments is uncertain.[7]

As for the larger institutions(enrollments of 5000 and up) there is more sentiment than science on the question of optimum size. Curricula and organization are so diverse and comparative data so slight that a search for ideal upper limits is elusive. At least one authority, however, has suggested 12,000 to 15,000 as optimum in terms of unit costs. The Wisconsin Coordinating Council for Higher Education has indicated eight factors to be considered in projecting maximum enrollments:

1. Mission of the university
2. Size of the community
3. Campus-community relationships
4. Expansion potential of campus
5. Enrollment potential of campus
6. Availability of other higher educational opportunity
7. Efficiency at assigned maximum
8. Existing enrollment[8]

The questionnaire elicited data on the sex, ethnic background, social class, ambitions and housing situations of students enrolled at the new colleges. The first finding (see table 4.4) is that only 15 percent of the new institutions started as colleges for either men (thirty-six colleges) or women (fifty-four colleges). By 1967, only 10 percent were still non-coeducational.

---

[7] Donald J. Reichard, Campus Size, A Selective Review (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1971) pp. 29-30.

[8] Ibid., p. 11.

TABLE 4.4

Percentage Distribution of Institutions,
By Sex of Student Bodies

Sex	Percentage of Institutions	
	At Founding	In 1967
Men	6	3
Women	9	7
Coed	85	90

At the coeducational institutions over a period of time the proportion of women increased in 16 percent of the colleges. The proportion of men, however, went up in only 8 percent of the coed colleges.

There was some evidence of growing heterogeneity not only in sex but also in the ethnic and class features of the student bodies (see table 4.5). Between 1963 and 1967 one out of five new colleges reported more mixture of ethnic backgrounds, and 15 percent reported greater heterogeneity of social classes among their students. Greater change occurred in students' "ambition for more advanced education," as reported by the presidents. That is to say, in 1967 as compared to five years earlier, a greater proportion of students in 37 percent of the colleges were seeking further education. Only 26 percent of the institutions reported no change in this respect. (It will be noted that the figures do not add up to 100 percent. This results from high rates of nonresponse for each of the three items. These findings, accordingly, evoke less certainty than one might like.)

TABLE 4.5

Changes in Composition of Student Body Since 1963

Characteristic - Student Body	Percentage of Institutions Reporting: More	No Change	Less
Ethnic heterogeneity	20	42	3
Social class mixture	15	46	3
Ambition for more advanced education	37	26	2

It has been stated that most students in the colleges sampled were commuters, a fact with extensive implications for educational composites and institutional characters. A recent study by Arthur W. Chickering is instructive. Analysis of the responses of more than 5000 students (selected randomly from a sample of 38,000 who responded to a 1968 ACE questionnaire) together with other ACE data, led Chickering to this generalization:

> In simplest terms, the differences between resident and commuting students are the differences between the haves and and the have nots. In general, the parents of residents have higher incomes and more education. Resident students received higher grades in high school and higher aptitude test scores. Their degree aspirations are higher and their average age is lower. They bring to college wider achievements and experiences in extracurricular activities, and broader interests in national and world affairs. They are more autonomous, more attuned to their own emotions and impulses, and -- consistent with the relative affluence of their parents -- they are less concerned about financial problems and materialistic success than their commuting peers.[9]

[9] Arthur W. Chickering, The Haves and Have Nots: Residents and Commuters in Higher Education, American Council on Education manuscript, 1971, p. 1.

In reality the situation is more complex than the generalization, as Chickering notes. There are several types of institutions where the generalization does not consistently apply: (1) At the public four-year colleges where the parents' educational backgrounds are similar for residents and for commuters; (2) at Protestant and Roman Catholic colleges where differences in parental backgrounds were not accompanied by as many differences between commuting and resident students; and (3) at technological institutions where residents and commuters were also less differentiated.

Some Student Problems

By manipulating admissions policies, college managers can alter the composition of their student bodies, although they must also reckon with additional factors. There was some indication in the ACE sample that the smaller colleges were having more difficulty getting the kinds of students they wanted than were the larger colleges. Presidents of the larger institutions were more likely to say that it was important and difficult to recruit disadvantaged students. Over half of them thought it highly important to enroll more disadvantaged students. In contrast, on the smaller campuses in 1967 only about one-fourth of the chief executives shared this view.

What do these two findings mean? The small institutions which are usually private are often struggling to recruit students. The composition of their student bodies is less important than the actual head count and resulting tuition payments. In the larger schools, however, which are more likely to be public two-year institutions, the struggle to recruit students is neither predominant nor pressing. At the same time, the influences of political expectations, federal requirements, and urban area pressures are stronger.

Demands that students participate in policy making and in educational operations at all levels have become widespread. At most of the new colleges and universities in the survey, participation was seen as moderately important and as entailing little difficulty. Only 3 percent of all the new colleges reported that student involvement was extremely difficult for them. Either they had no problem or the chief administrators attached little importance to it.

On the question of adequacy in handling problems of early development (perhaps a more telling question than the item eliciting estimates of importance and difficulty) four student-centered problems were handled particularly well (table 4.6).

TABLE 4.6

Presidents' Rating of Handling of Student Problems
In Early Development of "New" Institutions
by Type of Institution

Problem	Presidents' Responses of "Passable" and "Low" (Percentage)		
	2-Year	4-Year	Postbaccalaureate
Reflecting student needs and interests	46	51	49
Planning for extra-curricular student facilities and programs	64	69	61
Predicting the number of qualified students that would apply for admission	53	63	53
Planning for growth of campus size. .	40	37	45

Faculty

The faculties at the 550 institutions were not large. They averaged only twenty-two (fourteen full time and eight part time) when classes were first offered. By 1967 they had grown to an average of sixty-four (forty-two full time, twenty-two part time), or by nearly 300 percent. And this was very nearly the growth in average institutional enrollment, which was 304 percent (from 364 to 1105).

That the presidents thought faculty problems could have been better resolved in the early development of their institutions is indicated in table 4.7. Between 40 and 65 percent of the presidents rated the adequacy with which these aspects of faculty participation had been handled as just passable and low. Community college leaders displayed the greatest dissatisfaction concerning the handling of the first and last items. As for the second item, however, presidents of postbaccalaureate institutions showed the highest percentage of low or only passable ratings.

TABLE 4.7

Presidents' Rating of Handling of Faculty Problems in Early Development of "New" Institutions by Type of Institution

Problem	Presidents' Responses of "Passable" and "Low" (Percentage)		
	2-Year	4-Year	Postbaccalaureate
Recruiting faculty having same goals as governing board	46	42	45
Considering potential new directions, new learning techniques, new program organization	63	56	65
Involving first group of faculty in program planning, setting degree requirements and standards	52	41	31

The position of faculty-related problems in the thinking of the presidents is apparent in table 4.8, though the ratings on importance and difficulty are by no means uniform. Not surprisingly, at new and growing institutions, more than nine out of ten new college presidents rated the recruitment of "promising new faculty" as highly important. This task was thought to be difficult by about two-thirds of the presidents at all three types of institutions. "Holding effective teachers" ranked slightly behind recruitment in importance, but fewer presidents thought it was difficult. All six of the other faculty-related problems treated in table 4.8 appear much less important, though the difficulties of coping with them may be considerable. There are some striking differences also between the community colleges, four-year colleges, and the postbaccalaureate institutions on given problems, as for example, raising admissions standards and providing adequate research time.

TABLE 4.8

Presidents' Rating of Importance and Difficulty of Eight Faculty-Related Problems by Institutional Types

Problem	Presidents' Responses (Percentage)					
	2-Year		4-Year		Postbaccalaureate	
	Highly Important	Difficult	Highly Important	Difficult	Highly Important	Difficult
Attracting promising new faculty	92	67	92	66	96	63
Holding effective teachers	93	44	92	53	91	43
Holding productive research scholars	5	48	27	55	57	70
Raising admissions standards	14	32	31	63	20	44
Utilizing the community as an educational resource	46	44	38	52	27	41
Achieving student-faculty informal discussion	53	47	66	37	49	43
Providing adequate research time for faculty	13	46	30	64	60	73
Securing travel time for faculty	24	45	20	55	17	46

When responses to the eight faculty-related problems were analyzed by control of the respondent's institution, the first and second problems were most frequently indentified as both highly important and difficult to achieve. These same problems were again most frequently cited as highly important when respondents were categorized according to the size of their institutions.

Freedom and Evaluation

The questionnaire asked the presidents to rate the importance and difficulty of maintaining freedom of inquiry and discussion. The larger the campus, the more important the issue became. Of the presidents of the large schools, 77 percent rated it highly important, whereas 61 percent of the small school executives rated it highly important. As to the difficulty, the presidents were perhaps optimistic, especially in terms of some of the less spectacular but pervasive issues perceived by academicians these days. Generally, the presidents reported it not difficult. Fifty percent put the maintenance of free inquiry and discussion in the category of "low difficulty."

Eighty percent of the institutions surveyed reported that they had "a continuing institution-wide effort to review and evaluate" courses of instruction. The principal purposes were to keep the curriculum "up to date" (73 percent) and to see that its content was in accord with institutional goals (71 percent). To cut courses with low registration and therefore high costs was not a commonplace objective (20 percent). Responsibility for decision on the basis of evaluative analysis was vested in a dean's office usually with recommendations coming, in order, from a dean (64 percent), a department faculty (61 percent), a department chairman (59 percent), a course instructor (50 percent), and finally students (11 percent in the case of majors in the department, and 3 percent at large).

Evidently, the new institutions more likely would be known for their strong deans rather than their strong department chairmen. Just how the faculties would come out in the course evaluations one wonders, especially in view of the fact that faculties are not grouped in department units at many places. Students, in any event, were not given much voice in course evaluation procedures.

The fact that only a third of the new colleges and postbaccalaureate institutions reported having any "institutionwide program to evaluate faculty which includes more than appraisal by departmental chairmen and deans" may indicate regard for freedom of teaching. At some places it doubtless reflects faculty resistance to comprehensive evaluation programs.

At no institution was there evidence of an institutionwide analysis of <u>total</u> educational performance.

Chapter V

THE EDUCATIONAL APPARATUS

Once the major aspects of an institution's educational composite have been determined, and funds assured, then attention must be given to required materials and equipment. Because many new educational ventures flounder or fail for want of sufficient funding to underwrite trained manpower, grounds, buildings, and equipment, the importance of adequate initial financing cannot be overemphasized. Even with high purposes and ample funding, however, an embryonic college or university can have its development handicapped by serious mistakes regarding its educational apparatus.

The professed gift of a large estate with extensive grounds may entail a bad location that permanently impedes future growth. Impressive buildings are not always suited to academic use. Hidden maintenance and future construction costs may be excessive.

Campus Land Acquisition

Very few of the campuses in this study were as large as 1,000 acres. Many, indeed, began in rented store buildings, vacant factories, even in basements. As to acreage, for every type of institution, public and private, the majority began on sites of less than 100 acres.

TABLE 5.1

Percentage of "New" Institutions Renting Real Estate

	Renting	Not Renting
When first opened	27	73
In 1967	21	79

What inflated the averages in table 5.2 were the fractions with sizable sites in each category, and a few unusually large campuses. One public two-year institution, for example, reported a campus of 3,114 acres. Among four-year colleges and postbaccalaureates, seven public institutions reported campuses of between 1,000 and 2,000 acres.

TABLE 5.2

Average Campus Acreage of "New" Institutions by Type, in Year Classes Began

Control	2-Year	4-Year	Postbaccalaureate
Public	154	420	460
Private	94	128	144

Although most presidents seemed reasonably well satisfied with the size of their campuses, many emphasized the importance of trying to get as much land as possible at the outset. This may be particularly good advice if the college is to be located in a landlocked situation where its construction will affect values in the abutting area so that acquisition later on would be much costlier. Also it is advice that presupposes some rather accurate planning and programming if excessive speculation is to be avoided.

Various methods and schemes are used by new colleges to acquire land. They range from unabashed opportunism to time-consuming, detailed surveys replete with public hearings. The state of California has extensively investigated possible locations before deciding on sites for new universities or colleges. Each search may require from three to five years. Often, there is great rivalry between communities because of the economic and cultural advantages which the presence of a college or university entails.

The seven-step procedure followed in the case of the University of California at Santa Cruz might well be used for other colleges.

1. Investigate the institution's needs in order to determine the type of environment that will lend itself to development of a campus with the necessary educational, aesthetic, and developmental qualities.

2. Make forecasts of population growth and migration patterns to identify general areas in which suitable environments are likely.

3. Identify possible site areas by means of the criteria that have been developed in steps one and two.

4. Make preliminary studies of the most promising site areas, and recommend several for detailed analyses.

5. Make detailed studies of the site areas selected (by the Regents' Special Committee).

6. Select sites for the campus and for the university's faculty, staff and off-campus student housing and community facilities.

7. Prepare land use and circulation plans to illustrate the potentials of the sites.

Seventy-four sites were identified as possibilities for what became the University of California at Santa Cruz, fifteen of which were selected for further study. Of these, the Regents' Special Committee authorized detailed studies of six. Land use and circulation plans were prepared for each of the six, including studies of travel time and distances, location of utilities,

and soil condition. These detailed studies led to disqualification of two sites. The four remaining were analyzed for growth trends, existing housing inventories, job opportunities and climate as these might affect the new university. The likely character of the community that would grow up around the institution on these sites was projected, and existing local governments were examined. Costs and patterns of ownership were investigated and special costs of construction associated with each site were evaluated. Of the four that were given the final and most detailed treatment by the consultants, the site at Santa Cruz was eventually chosen on the basis of its greater benefits, all things considered. In addition to the net plus for the Santa Cruz location which was indicated by objective analysis and planning, there was also a subjective plus factor. When the Regents saw Santa Cruz on the day of their final visit, the weather was perfect, whereas temperatures at the competitive location were "uncomfortably high."

The prospective donors or sellers of land or donors of funds have no doubt influenced some sites of new colleges. In Florida, for example, the interest of the Boca Raton community in getting a new state university built on an abandoned U.S. Air Force base there, together with political pressure to locate some distance from Miami, figured prominently in the selection of Boca Raton for the Florida Atlantic University. Another state university, Florida Technological University, was to have been located on the East coast near Melbourne and Cape Kennedy, or in North Florida around Jacksonville. As the debate over location progressed, the sites mentioned were ever more westward or inland, reflecting continuing pressures brought upon the state Boards of Education and Regents. Orlando was the final choice.

Public institutions suffer at least one disadvantage when they come to creating their physical plant, namely, that public business is conducted more openly than is private business. Once the news is out that a search is on, land prices can and do soar. Private college builders can more secretively acquire options on several sites while reserving their final choice until studies are completed. And if their financing is adequate, they may more easily purchase land and hold it until campus development is to begin.

Private colleges, it was observed, were likely to get themselves into a condition in which they seemed to be "land rich" but in fact were "land poor." One college, for example, had been given land worth about $500,000. The founders then put the land up as collateral for a $750,000 loan to cover initial development costs. Interest charges at 5 percent and other operating costs were scheduled to come from tuition and fees -- a risky undertaking, especially with interest rates rising and public college competition ever keener.

The presidents interviewed reported fewer land acquisition difficulties when the locations were not urban, that is to say, when institutions were not located either in a central city or a metropolitan area. Small communities frequently gave land to get a new college in their midst. In central cities and suburbs it was another matter, and commonly a very expensive one. With cities hard pressed to meet their own financial obligations, few can make gifts of land or look with favor on the removal of land from their tax rolls.

Acquiring Facilities

According to results of the survey, however, fewer presidents indicated difficulty over land acquisition than over the expansion of library collections, another physical facility constituting a major budget item at most institutions. This held true whether the respondents were from two-year, four-year or postbaccalaureate institutions. When responses were categorized by size of institution, the proportion of presidents from large institutions indicating difficulty with land acquisition (54 percent) slightly exceeded the percentage reporting difficulty with library expansion (50 percent).

TABLE 5.3

Presidents' Rating of Difficulty of Providing Physical Facilities by Type of Institution

Problem	Presidents' Responses (Percentage)					
	Not Difficult			Difficult		
	2-Year	4-Year	Post-baccalaureate	2-Year	4-Year	Post-baccalaureate
Increasing productivity through use of educational technology	25	27	33	75	73	67
Acquiring land for campus needs . .	56	73	44	44	27	56
Expanding library holdings	38	25	28	62	75	72

TABLE 5.4

Presidents' Rating of Difficulty of Providing Physical Facilities by Size of Institution

Problem	Presidents' Responses (Percentage)					
	Not Difficult			Difficult		
	Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
Increasing productivity through use of educational technology	30	18	8	71	82	92
Acquiring land for campus needs	57	60	46	43	40	54
Expanding library holdings	32	37	50	68	63	50

The third item of apparatus, the hardware technology of instruction (television, radio, films, computers, etc.), was perceived as difficult by more presidents than either libraries or land (tables 5.3, 5.4), except for the heads of four-year and postbaccalaureate institutions (table 5.3). However, few thought it very important to increase productivity through use of educational technology (tables 5.5, 5.6). This contrasted sharply with the sizable number who rated library expansion highly important.

TABLE 5.5

Presidents' Rating of Importance of Providing Physical Facilities, by Type of Institution

Problem	Presidents' Responses of "Highly Important" (Percentage)		
	2-Year	4-Year	Postbaccalaureate
Increasing productivity through use of educational technology	41	26	27
Acquiring land for campus needs	39	21	40
Expanding library holdings	78	83	85

TABLE 5.6

Presidents' Rating of Importance of Providing Physical Facilties by Size of Institution

Problem	Presidents' Responses of "Highly Important" (Percentage)		
	Small	Medium	Large
Increasing productivity through use of educational technology	36	41	38
Acquiring land for campus needs	32	42	38
Expanding library holdings	77	83	79

Housing

Less than 10 percent of the 1967 enrollment at institutions responding to the ACE questionnaire lived in campus housing. This overall percentage, however, hides wide variations. Whereas only 1 percent of the students at public two-year institutions lived on campus, nearly half of those attending private four-year institutions were reported to live in housing provided by the institution. (See table 2.19.)

For many institutions, student housing is an important question educationally, a principal factor in any environment for learning. Institutional policies regarding student housing have of late been complicated by the growing resistance of students to "bureaucratic housing" as they seek more freedom from any supervision of their extra-curricular living. This is especially true of the residential and cluster colleges (such as University of California at Santa Cruz). The plan for Santa Cruz was to develop college-by-college on a modular basis, so as to provide residential facilities for two-thirds of the undergraduates. By 1970-71, however, only

about 60 percent lived in college housing, as more and more students elected to commute from their homes or from housing off campus. Originally, the students at Santa Cruz were not required to live on campus, but recently the administration declared their "expectation" that everyone, for at least one year, should live on campus. Several large universities, especially some in the Midwest, now have "white elephant" dormitories with vacancy rates in excess of 50 percent. In efforts to reverse the growing unpopularity of much institutional housing, new designs and furnishings have been tried, along with changes in the parietal rules. Rule changes have usually been away from in loco parentis and toward more and more permissiveness and student freedom.

The amount of dormitory or residence, or apartment housing that is built on campus -- if any -- should be a function of the kind of learning experiences desired, both formal and informal, the kind of student body, and the kind of housing supply that is already accessible or planned off campus. To make dependable assessments of the latter, college builders should analyze the local housing market, perhaps with the aid of housing experts. A similar analysis should also be made of housing and facilities for faculty and staff.

Mounting costs of new construction even under the most favorable conditions are causing many institution builders these days to revise earlier plans. For example, in 1971, the State University of New York announced a cutback in residence hall construction that will reduce projected costs by nearly $400 million over the next five years. The trustees decided to eliminate approximately 30,000 beds from the original plans for the University's twenty-seven campuses. Previously determined enrollment goals will not be altered, the trustees said, but construction at an average low-bid cost of $7,500 per room will be avoided. By 1971, construction

costs had run to $6,000 per bed and carried an economic rental to students of $550 per year. This also came at a time of statewide budget crisis in New York. Problems of supervision and maintenance and the rejection "by more and more students" of institutional living were also cited in the announcement. That this cutback decision will affect numerous educational programs and the nature of campus life at the individual campuses goes without saying. (Reference: American Council on Education, Higher Education and National Affairs, May 14, 1971.)

One buildings expert, Frederick C. Wood, contends that the cost of renovating an old building may be 40 percent to 65 percent of the cost of new construction. And in most cases, renovating takes less than half the time required to put up a new building. (Reference: The Chronicle of Higher Education, April 12, 1971, p. 6.) Other advantages of renovating old buildings are that they usually cost less to heat, having heavier walls and less glass, and their facades are often more attractive or more compatible with neighboring buildings.

Many of the arguments against rehabilitating buildings are noneconomic. New buildings have more glamour, they impose no limitations on size, and they allow greater freedom of arrangement. Also, from an architect's viewpoint, it takes more time, patience and ingenuity to fit new educational programs into old buildings. From an economic standpoint, an old building may waste valuable land area, and land-use value in itself may justify a new structure. Sometimes a drawback to renewing old structures is that they are peculiarly shaped, or are constructed internally so that rehabilitation becomes unusually expensive.

Libraries and Instructional Aids

The presidents were nearly as concerned over books and libraries as they were over general budgets and capital funds. (See tables 5.5 and 6.2.) No doubt they had good reason to be so concerned in view of the standards of accrediting associations, and inasmuch as the average collection at their new institutions was little more than 11,000 volumes. And even this figure is probably high since those colleges with the smallest collections were least likely to be reported by their presidents. (Only slightly more than half the sample, 323, responded to this particular question.) ACE site visits reported library collections that ranged from a single set of the Encyclopedia Britannica to collections of more than 280,000 volumes.

TABLE 5.7

Percentage of Library Resources by Type of Institution

Volumes at End of First Year	2-Year	4-Year	Postbaccalaureate
Less than 5,000	45	42	17
5,000 to 10,000	37	33	17
10,000 to 15,000	9	10	16
15,000 to 30,000	7	12	16
30,000 to 60,000	2	1	17
60,000 to 100,000	0	1	4
More than 100,000	0	1	13

Table 5.7 showing initial holdings by type of institution confirms that postbaccalaureate institutions have the largest collections, four-year colleges the next largest, and two-year colleges the smallest.

The majority of presidents desired much larger library collections than existed at the start of the institution, and new library buildings as well. The four-year college presidents sought collections ranging from 35,000 to

75,000 volumes. Many thought that carefully selected collections no larger than 50,000 volumes would be entirely satisfactory for a good liberal arts program that enrolled no more than 1,000 students. Such thinking is remarkably in line with the standards of the American Library Association. For four-year undergraduate instruction, the ALA states,

> An analysis of small college library statistics suggests that no library can be expected to give effective support to the instructional program if it contains fewer than 50,000 carefully chosen volumes. A steady growth is essential to any good college library. The rate of growth of the library collection may slow down, however, when the number of volumes reaches approximately 500,000. Since there appears to be a correlation between the growth of the student body and the growth of the collection, there is a convenient measure based upon observation of the development of college libraries, which may serve as a guide: up to 600 students, 50,000 volumes; for every additional 200 students, 10,000 volumes. Part-time and extension students should be equated into full-time student figures for the purpose of such computations.[10]

For two-year colleges the American Library Association has scaled down the above norms. The following statement pertains not only to junior colleges ("primarily concerned with the liberal arts and limited in their vocational aims") but also to the less limited community colleges and technical institutes as well.

> A two-year institution of up to 1,000 students (full-time equivalent) cannot discharge its mission without a carefully selected collection of at least 20,000 volumes, exclusive of duplicates and textbooks. Junior colleges with broad curriculum offerings will tend to have much larger collections; an institution with a multiplicity of programs may need a minimum collection of two or three times the basic figure of 20,000 volumes. The book holdings should be increased as the enrollment grows and the complexity and depth of course offerings expand. Consultation with many junior college librarians indicates that for most junior college librarians a convenient yardstick would be the following: the bookstock should be enlarged by 5,000 volumes for every 500 students (full-time equivalent) beyond 1,000.[11]

---

10 ALA Standards for College Libraries, Reprinted from College and Research Libraries, July 1959, Vol. 20, p. 277.

11 ALA Standards for Junior College Libraries, Reprinted from College and Research Libraries, May 1960, Vol. XXI, p. 203.

Differences of opinion as to the best sized library collections for four-year colleges seemed to arise from two considerations: (1) the possibility that a college's students and faculty could easily use other libraries, (2) the importance to the institution of faculty scholarly and scientific research. Some presidents thought that holdings which were appropriate for undergraduate teaching might suffer if there was a significant buildup of research collections. Several spoke of ways of helping their faculty visit graduate centers in order to find adequate collections.

When it came to facilitating the varied kinds of learning and instruction so important to the great numbers of students from all backgrounds who are nonverbally oriented, the presidents were noticeably less concerned and less innovative. Table 5.8 shows the extent of utilization of institutional technology in all the institutions responding. Between 75 and 80 percent responded on these items, in contrast to

TABLE 5.8

Utilization of Instructional Technology

	Presidents' Responses (Percentage)		
Techniques	Very Extensive	Moderate	Little or No
Motion pictures	18	55	8
Radio	2	14	61
Audio tapes	22	47	11
Teaching machines	5	18	53
Closed circuit TV	3	12	60
Broadcast TV.	1	11	63
Language laboratories	34	23	21
Computer-assisted instruction . .	4	7	64
Dial access systems	3	3	67
Computers for research	2	14	59

the much lower response on library questions. The high percentages indicating only "moderate" and "little or no" utilization probably reflect the teaching-as-usual preferences of most faculty members at their institutions. No significant difference in use was discernible between public and private or between large and small institutions.

The only technique used "very extensively" by as many as a third of the new institutions was language laboratories. Combining extensive and moderate usage, motion pictures are the most used, audio tapes are second, and language laboratories third. Least used are four techniques with great potential for individually paced learning and for wide dissemination of the best teaching: dial-access systems, computer-assisted instruction, television, and teaching machines.

However, confronted by mounting enrollments, larger proportions of nonverbal learners, a vast need for remedial programs, pressures for greater productivity, and scarcities of qualified teachers, there would seem to be no alternative for new institutions but to begin to use more extensively the new instructional technology.

Various electronic media can be used with other media -- lectures and small sessions -- to transmit instruction to the student, sometimes on a mass basis, other times on an individualized basis. These methods are well suited to direct instruction, bringing the student into real situations that would be impractical or impossible for him actually to experience otherwise. The computer offers countless opportunities for simulation of reality in laboratory experiments, vocational practice situations, and engineering design. Some media lend themselves readily to student use in career education programs. A few experiments already involving student learning by actually using video tape and films have been highly successful.

Chapter VI

BUDGETING AND FINANCE

At many of the institutions visited, early dreams had turned into nightmares, particularly for presidents and business managers. This was often the case in small communities where new private colleges had been built on the belief that such deserving causes once launched (i.e. its apparatus visible and properly symbolic) would attract financial angels.

In several communities, disillusion followed over-persuasion that it was easy to start a college with very little money. The students would come, revenues would rise, and the community would profit greatly. Out of such stuff dreams were made and disillusion came, at considerable cost. The word gets around, of course, and failures may increase fund-raising problems for other private colleges engaged in close struggles for solvency or for survival.

Disillusioning Experiences

At one place the board of a newly planned institution had been advised by the president, "Let's borrow the money and build a new campus. When the buildings are visible, the students will come to fill them." The fact was the students did not come and a deficit of $150,000 was incurred in the first year. The local banks wondered when their loan would be repaid. The following year they might wonder whether it would be repaid at all.

At another institution, the board hit a solid rock of realism in their second year when they faced a deficit of $350,000 instead of the one they had budgeted, which was only $80,000. The college prophet told them the enrollment would be 800, all from the local community. Only 400 had turned up, and most of these had to be recruited in a national effort at the last minute. Some members of the board now wanted to close the college, but the banks who held the notes urged them to give it "the old college try," at least.

At one new college the president was trying to pick up the financial pieces from his predecessor. In the process, he was slashing academic programs, and cutting back a costly summer program that was originally planned as a moneymaker. He described how early budgets had been made, a fantastic "backward budgeting."

> I think the way they made the budget was to figure out how much they wanted to spend. Then they calculated the number of students it would take to earn enough tuition income to cover the cost. This number became their projected enrollment.

Enrollment was much lower than anticipated, and the president was trying to persuade some of the faculty to go elsewhere, though they had already arrived. And they had signed contracts containing summer-indemnity clauses under which the college was obliged to pay even if their courses did not materialize.

At another institution the first year tuition charge, $2000, would have been high enough to cover the original budget. However, the board wanted a winning basketball team the first year, and the president went along in this athletic adventure. Sixty students were given full tuition basketball scholarships in their first year, and others got part remissions. The second year, there was no basketball team and no college.

"Ninety percent of my time as president is spent raising money to cover the monthly payroll," one president told us. He had sold the Chamber of Commerce on a new college. The grand idea was that the community would enjoy great economic benefits, and only $200,000 seed money would be needed from the community. That could (and did) come from loans, not gifts. "With good business practices, we can't miss," the salesman-president had argued. Alas, the expected 700 students in the first year turned out to be a mere 160, producing a hefty deficit. When this busy president was interviewed, the college owed $1.4 million on unsecured notes, mortgages, and bills. Asked about his plans, he drew a one-page financial projection out of the files which showed a projected surplus for each year beginning with the first! Nowhere was there a capital budget, yet sizable capital debts had been incurred and expansive physical plans made. Enrollment projections were ethereal, not empirical.

At numerous institutions, mainly private, financial controls were inadequate, and sometimes nonexistent. One financial officer voiced his problems with the faculty.

> What do you do with a faculty that is used to just calling up a supplier and ordering that something be delivered, and the bill be sent directly to the college?

At the same institution, the dean asked,

> How can you plan when you don't know how much money you've got? How can you budget when the president keeps the books in his desk drawer and even the business manager has trouble getting to see them?

Several new private institutions were found to be in good condition financially. Brandeis University, for example, with its national support and its ability to attract highly qualified students and a first-rate

faculty was in a good position. The horror stories reiterated do not characterize the majority of new institutions, but they did turn up all too frequently. Private liberal arts colleges founded by inexperienced people and irresponsible entrepreneurs were usually the setting. The most common error seemed to be inflated enrollment projection.

> They kept telling us that we would have great trouble getting faculty, but we would have no problem attracting students. Everybody we talked to said students would be coming out of our ears. We learned too late that we were competing with public colleges and with our community colleges. They do not have to charge what we do, and they can use all kinds of expensive equipment in their educational programs that we can't possibly hope to get our hands on.

Seldom do state supported colleges of any kind find themselves in such a situation. Their enrollment projections tend to be more realistic and, when they do err, enrollment tends to be greater then expected, not less. While adequacy of resources relative to student demand or need is often problematic at the public institutuions, they usually survive at some level. But this does not mean that the presidents of state institutions are not apprehensive about financial problems.

Facing Realities

Along with gathering a faculty, and achieving educational purposes, the presidents rated financing the most difficult and most important of their many problems. They also thought it had been the least well handled of all factors in the early stages of their new colleges (see Chapter 3). Ratings on the importance and difficulty of five financial problems showed no great differences between presidents at private and public institutions (table 6.1), with the exception of the matter of filling dormitories. Inasmuch as the public portion of the ACE sample was heavily weighted with community colleges which have few dormitories,

this is not surprising. In general, however, the percentage of presidents that reported difficulty on the problems was higher in the private sector than in the public.

TABLE 6.1

Presidents' Rating of Importance and Difficulty of Financial Problems, by Control of Institution

Problem (In Order of Importance at Public Institutions)	Presidents' Responses (Percentage)			
	Public		Private	
	Highly Important	Difficult	Highly Important	Difficult
Maintaining adequate educational and general budget	90	83	88	92
Securing capital funds	77	85	78	93
Developing financial support from the community	58	66	68	89
Securing financial support from the federal government	45	76	60	78
Keeping dormitories filled	15	19	55	52

Capital and Operating Funds

Most often rated difficult and highly important was either securing capital funds or maintaining support for operating budgets (tables 6.1, 2 and 3). The latter was rated difficult ("moderately" or "extremely") by 100 percent of the presidents at large institutions, though everywhere it was either one or two in importance and difficulty. Again, there is evidence of the need for a competent business manager or comptroller from the beginning of any new college, alongside the president and his chief academic officer.

TABLE 6.2

Presidents' Rating of Importance and Difficulty of Financial Problems, by Type of Institution

Problems (In Order of Importance at 2-Year Institutions)	Presidents' Responses (Percentage)					
	2-Year		4-Year		Postbaccalaureate	
	Highly Important	Difficult	Highly Important	Difficult	Highly Important	Difficult
Maintaining adequate educational and general budget	89	84	89	90	90	92
Securing capital funds	78	87	78	90	75	84
Developing financial support from the community	60	71	67	84	60	81
Securing financial support from the federal government	46	78	63	79	55	68
Keeping dormitories filled	29	32	59	49	31	27

Developing Sources of Funds

The third- or fourth-ranked financial problems were "source" problems. Cultivating and securing financial support whether from the community or the federal government are important matters for most college presidents except those at community colleges where financing has been most directly local and state (table 6.2). The two "source problems" were considered difficult and important by a larger percentage of the four-year college respondents than by those from the other two types of institutions. When the data are analyzed by size of institution, over 90 percent of the presidents at large institutions reported difficulty with sources of support. Corresponding percentages from the small- and medium-sized institutions did not approach that figure.

In contrasting federal with community support, a slightly smaller percentage of the respondents indicated difficulty with the latter (74 percent) than with federal support (77 percent). This relationship holds true when institutions are categorized by size. Interestingly enough, when institutions are classed by control (table 6.1) or type (table 6.2) a consistent pattern does not appear. Nearly nine-tenths of the private respondents indicated difficulty with community support whereas only three-fourths reported difficulty with federal. Likewise, table 6.2 shows that more of the respondents from four-year and post-baccalaureate institutions (84 and 81 percent) reported difficulty with community support than with federal (79 and 68 percent).

TABLE 6.3

Presidents' Rating of Importance and Difficulty of Financial Problems, by Size of Institution

Problem (In Order of Importance at Small Institutions)	Presidents' Responses (Percentage)					
	Small		Medium		Large	
	Highly Important	Difficult	Highly Important	Difficult	Highly Important	Difficult
Maintaining adequate educational and general budget . . .	89	88	89	80	100	100
Securing capital funds	77	91	79	83	83	87
Developing financial support from the community	59	77	64	63	64	91
Securing financial support from the federal government . .	53	78	43	75	50	96
Keeping dormitories filled . .	48	50	27	16	10	14

Table 6.1 shows that a larger proportion of the private institutions (60 percent) than public (45 percent) considers federal support highly important. Approximately three-fourths of both public and private respondents noted that federal support was difficult to secure.

Keeping Dormitories Filled

The small, four-year private colleges have the most trouble with dormitory occupancy problems and far more frequently view them as highly important and difficult than do other institutions (tables 6.1, 2 and 3). This is not surprising since few of the two-year colleges, which compose the bulk of the sample, had many dormitory rooms or experienced under-enrollment problems.

Even at the small, four-year private institutions the dormitory problem was not listed as "difficult" nearly as often as were other problems. It was also listed as "highly important" less frequently than any of the other four problems.

First Budgets and Growing Expenditures

Capital budgets were not studied in the ACE survey because they are so bound to local situations that revealing comparisons are virtually impossible. In some instances, new colleges get by very well with old buildings and equipment, and make virtually no capital outlays. At the other extreme, completely new and needed campuses are designed by celebrated architects and cost millions. Still, it was operating budgets, budgets for education and general administrative expense, that this study investigated.

The budget totals for different kinds of colleges during the first year of classes (table 6.4) show that about one-fourth (24 percent) of the two-year colleges had budgets of less than $100,000. About the same percentage (23 percent) of the postbaccalaureate institutions began at this level, but a larger fraction of four-year colleges (30 percent) began at this level. The great majority of all kinds of new institutions budgeted less than $500,000 for their first year of classes.

TABLE 6.4

Percentage Distribution of Institutions by Size of Budget for First Year of Classes and 1967, and by Type of Institution

Budget	Type					
	2-Year		4-Year		Postbaccalaureate	
	First Year	1967	First Year	1967	First Year	1967
Less than $100,000	24	4	30	4	23	4
$100,000-$300,000	29	18	34	15	19	11
$300,000-$500,000	19	14	19	12	17	19
$500,000-$1,000,000	18	26	13	35	12	9
$1,000,000-$1,500,000	6	14	2	15	6	5
$1,500,000-$2,000,000	2	5	0	11	2	6
$2,000,000-$5,000,000	2	15	2	8	17	23
More than $5,000,000	0	4	0	0	4	23

At the other extreme were the comparatively affluent new institutions that budgeted more than $1 million for the first year of classes. These comprised only 4 percent of the four-year colleges, 10 percent of the two-year colleges, and 29 percent of the postbaccalaureate institutions. Some of these "new" institutions were, in fact, operating educational activities that were changing their form--Seattle Community College and University of Illinois, Chicago Circle, for example.

Further examination of table 6.4 permits comparison of first-year budgets to those for fiscal year 1967. The actual interim is not apparent, but it is at least one year and not more than twenty.

Table 6.4 contains a predictable finding: budgets in 1967 were larger than for the first year in all three types of institutions. Those that had budgets in excess of $1 million by 1967 included about one-third of the two- and four-year colleges and slightly over half of the postbaccalaureate institutions.

In general, more public institutions than private showed high expenditure levels, both in the first year of classes and in 1967. But the public institutions were the ones with the largest enrollments.

Chapter VII

THE LEADERSHIP FUNCTION

Although the survey data were not collected with any particular view or list of structural and leadership problems in mind, several of the findings are illuminating.

The Presidents' Views of Their Problems

Presidents of the new institutions were asked to rate the difficulty and the importance of ten administrative problems of a general nature. That is to say, each problem's implications were broader than a single operational or social sector of the institution, such as student personnel or budget making for a health services training program. The ten problems are listed in table 7.1, rated for importance and difficulty by the presidents of public and private institutions.

TABLE 7.1

Presidents' Rating of Organizational and Leadership Problems by Control of Institution

Problem	Presidents' Responses (Percentage)			
	Public		Private	
	Highly Important	Difficult	Highly Important	Difficult
Attracting experienced administrators	80	70	62	65
Involving students in general policy making . . .	27	52	26	50
Maintaining freedom of inquiry and discussion . . .	70	30	67	25
Holding nonacademic staff. .	51	58	34	48
Communicating with the governing board	75	37	70	31
Involving students in educational policy-making	12	43	15	37
Identifying potential administrators	57	57	55	66
Communications among students, faculty and administrators	80	73	73	61
Achieving educational aims	89	70	90	69
Developing a structure for faculty government	59	55	48	50

When the responses to the ten general administrative items were further tabulated, comparing institutions by educational type and size as well as by status, the principal findings emerge as follows.

At Public Institutions	At Private Institutions
The Four Problems Most Frequently Rated Highly Important	
1. Achieving educational aims	1. Achieving educational aims
2. Internal communications and Experienced administrators	2. Internal communications
3. Communications to board	3. Communications to board
4. Freedom of inquiry and discussion	4. Freedom of inquiry and discussion
The Four Problems Most Frequently Rated Difficult	
1. Internal communications	1. Achieving educational aims
2. Experienced administrators and Achieving educational aims	2. Identifying potential administrators
3. Holding nonacademic staff	3. Experienced administrators
4. Identifying potential administrators	4. Internal communications

Variations in Presidents' Ratings of Problems

At Two-year Colleges

The Four Problems Most Frequently Rated Highly Important:

1. Achieving educational aims
2. Internal communications
3. Communications to board
4. Experienced administrators

The four Problems Most Frequently Rated Difficult:

1. Internal communications
2. Experienced administrators
3. Achieving educational aims
4. Identifying potential administrators

At Four-year Colleges

The Four Problems Most Frequently Rated Highly Important:

1. Achieving educational aims
2. Internal communications
3. Freedom of inquiry and discussion
4. Experienced administrators

The four Problems Most Frequently Rated Difficult:

1. Achieving educational aims
2. Experienced administrators
3. Identifying potential administrators
4. Internal communications

At Postbaccalaureate Institutions

The Four Problems Most Frequently Rated Highly Important:

1. Achieving educational aims
2. Freedom of inquiry and discussion
3. Experienced administrators
4. Internal communications

The four Problems Most Frequently Rated Difficult:

1. Achieving educational aims
2. Experienced administrators and Identifying potential administrators
3. Internal communications
4. Holding nonacademic staff

At Small Insts. (1,000 or less)

The Four Problems Most Frequently Rated Highly Important:

1. Achieving educational aims
2. Internal communications
3. Communications to board and Experienced administrators
4. Freedom of inquiry and discussion

The Four Problems Most Frequently Rated Difficult:

1. Achieving educational aims
2. Experienced administrators
3. Internal communications
4. Identifying potential administrators

At Medium Insts. (1,000-5,000)

The Four Problems Most Frequently Rated Highly Important:

1. Achieving educational aims
2. Internal communications
3. Communications to board
4. Experienced administrators

The Four Problems Most Frequently Rated Difficult:

1. Internal communications
2. Achieving educational aims
3. Experienced administrators
4. Identifying potential administrators

At Large Insts. (5,000 and over)

The Four Problems Most Frequently Rated Highly Important:

1. Internal communications and Experienced administrators
2. Achieving educational aims
3. Freedom of inquiry and discussion
4. Faculty government structure

The Four Problems Most Frequently Rated Difficult:

1. Experienced administrators and Internal communications
2. Achieving educational aims
3. Identifying potential administrators
4. Holding nonacademic staff and Involving students in general policy making

Time on the Job and Formation of Executive Groups

The average tenure in office for the presidents who returned the questionnaire was 4.5 years. Among public institutions, the average was 4.0 years, but at the private colleges the presidents had been in office 5.6 years. Comparing the different types of institutions, for two-year colleges it was 4.0; for four-year colleges, 5.8; and for postbaccalaureate institutions, 5.5.

The executive groups which had been on hand for early planning and development varied from one institution to another. Because a sizable proportion of the respondents provided ambiguous data in response to the questionnaire items dealing with the formation of the early executive groups, only the broadest generalizations can be drawn. It appears that the public institutions assembled more of the key officers (chief academic officer, business officer, etc.) and did so faster than the private institutions. Only about three-fourths of the institutions reported appointment of the chief academic officer in the same year as the presidents. From the data in hand there is scant basis for optimism in the critical matters of an early executive group of two or three top officials at every institution. At community colleges and postbaccalaureate institutions there is some evidence in another tabulation that the early situation was better in these institutions than it was at the four-year colleges.

Presidents Judge Their Boards

In the questionnaire, the presidents were asked how adequately a number of factors had been handled in the early development of their institutions. One of these factors was "the breadth of past experience and knowledge of educational institutions among board members." There were seventeen

factors in all and this one received the lowest rating of the seventeen. It fell below passable on a scale of adequacy ranging from low through passable to high. In contrast, the factor given the highest rating was "the involvement of the first executive officer in early planning," which was rated between passable and high on the average. This may reflect a certain enmity between many presidents and their boards, the egocentricity of presidents, or both. Another factor which the presidents were asked to rate was "the effective use of members of the governing board." This they rated somewhat above passable, a little below the average rating given other factors.

Although their responses were highly subjective, of course, the presidents' answers show that whenever they felt their board members had been effectively used, they also rated other factors high and vice versa. There is some evidence of a one dimensional continuum here along which the following items might array themselves in "scale" fashion. The items which seemed to associate with "the effective use of members of the governing board" are these:

1. Reflection of student needs and interests;
2. Communication with community leaders;
3. Consideration of potential new directions, new learning techniques; new program organization;
4. Use of experienced educational consultants;
5. Translation of stated goals of institution into programs, budgets, staffs and facilities;
6. Breadth of past experience and knowledge of educational institutions among the board members.

Anyone who tries to measure the effectiveness of a board confronts considerable difficulties. The ultimate test of a board is in the way it faces up to its most important responsibilities: (1) to provide a two-way representational link between the campus and the community; (2) to set policies for admissions, educational programs, and tuition charges; and (3) to select qualified men for the presidential office. How well they succeed is reflected in no small measure by the health and performance of the institutions for which they are responsible. (A discussion of boards, their composition and functions, may be found in a booklet published by the American Association of Junior Colleges, Community College Trustees: Responsibilities and Opportunities, by Mitchell Tender and R.E. Wilson, 1970, p. 30.)

Some Characteristics of the Boards

The ultimate corporate responsibility for any college or university, vague and poorly reviewed though it may be, rests with a governing board. Slightly more than two-thirds of the new institutions' boards were called boards of trustees. The others were designated regents or directors and, in a few cases, governors. Nine out of ten boards were appointed for definite terms of office; the maximum was sixteen years, the minimum one year, and the average five. In only 10 percent of the boards of the new institutions were the terms indefinite. The average size of the governing board of the new institutions was slightly over nine, with men outnumbering women more than eight to one.

Appointment by a state governor, election by a self-perpetuating board or by the public are the most frequent methods of selection. Half of the public colleges reported their boards included as ex officio their chief executive or, in the case of some two-year community colleges, the

state or city superintendent of schools. Nearly 65 percent of private boards also include the institution's chief executive ex officio. About 5 percent of the boards included representatives of the alumni, and about 3 percent also included representatives of the faculty.

As for the occupational backgrounds of governing board members, the largest fraction, about two-fifths, came from industry and business. A third came from the three fields of education, law, and religion. Medicine, finance, government, and labor were also represented. About 95 percent were still active in their occupations while about 5 percent were retired. About three times as many lawyers were on public college boards as were on private boards. On the other hand, religious affiliations were represented ten times more frequently on private boards than on public.

Trouble at the Top

Campus visits and case studies revealed some of the difficulties that one expects between presidents and their boards. They also revealed some surprises. Several presidents wanted to talk about the proper responsibilities of their boards. Some believed their boards had not been adequately briefed or carefully selected for their capabilities. One young president declared,

> We should have selected our board members with a little more care and then discussed their responsibilties with them. We need people on the board who have contacts with money, if they don't have money themselves. We also need people with more experience in higher education and some individuals from other parts of the country where things are perhaps done differently.

Another said, "Without exception, my board members are as green as grass. They have absolutely no background in higher education, and can only think in terms of this town." This was to be expected inasmuch as the charter specified that the majority should come from the county.

The concern for broader interests on boards that was found in campus visits is reflected in the actions of numerous Roman Catholic groups lifting bars against lay membership. As Roman Catholic institutions have sought more non-Roman Catholic students and have developed more diverse academic programs, appointments of lay members to their boards have become commonplace. Lay administrators and professors are also more numerous.

One new private non-sectarian college planned to have two boards. One, composed of only three people, would be given the legal and statutory authority under the law to operate the institution. The other would be empowered to exercise a veto over the decisions of the first, and would be principally responsible for long-range academic and fiscal planning, acting as a kind of broker between the institution and its environment. The idea of two boards, of course, is not entirely new. Harvard University for many years has had its "President and Fellows" and its "Board of Overseers."

Numerous conflicts were reported in which the administration and the faculty were pitted against the board. The new board chairman of a struggling private college said ruefully,

> We sure made some mistakes. We started out by quarreling with the staff and the faculty until my predecessors gave up and went away. The new board which I came in with went to just the other extreme and gave to the president absolute powers. They gave him complete authority over budget, fund raising, faculty appointment and academic program. In fact they turned over to the president all the decisions relative to planning and developing the college and he was delighted to keep the board at arms-length. And we seemed to prefer it that way. We knew practically nothing about what was going on in the college.

The board chairman was working with other members of a reconstituted board in an effort to pick up the pieces and restructure their relationship to the college, its new president, faculty and students. For the first time, they now recognized their legal responsibility to the public.

The function of a board as a buffer between an institution and community was illustrated at a community college. One of the townspeople stated,

> This community was really shocked and said so when they saw their first long-haired kids in town. They lived over on Main Street but they were jaywalking all over the place and the downtown was their campus so far as they were concerned.

Then, interestingly enough, he went on to say,

> Throughout all the ruckus the college board stood firm behind what they wanted to do and now the community is beginning to understand. The faculty are starting to take part in the religious and civic activities of the town, and folks are beginning to accept the outsiders that had come in as rather unfamiliar student types.

Just who should raise the money was a pointed issue in several cases. One president in trouble with his board thought that they did not understand their fiscal responsibility. As he put it,

> They live with a kind of wish fulfillment approach and believe if we get enough students we will get enough money to operate. To them it is as simple as that. Of course, I am the despair of the trustees for I appear to them to be interested only in academic affairs but, on the other hand, they seem to me to be interested only in business -- their own business. And they think that I should be the one to raise the money.

Needless to say, until the impasse is resolved the prospects for this fledgling institution are less than bright.

Perhaps the complaints most often heard from presidents and faculty members had to do with board members dabbling in administrative affairs on campus, and establishing channels of communication with faculty and students whereby they bypassed their president. Th se complaints were heard both at public and private institutions. Others complained that their boards were disinterested. Sometimes the same persons criticized board members for disinterest in the college and also for meddling in campus affairs.

Some of the principal dabblers were said to be retired businessmen accustomed to being vigorously involved in their enterprises. Now retired and on a college board, they saw the college as their chief concern and they could not keep out of campus administration. Some had even set up offices near the campus to make their participation easier.

It should be noted that more and more questions about the responsibilities of boards are being raised as students come to participate more actively in campus councils, some of which include faculty and administrators. Also, strikes and protests are presenting boards with dilemmas that they are often unprepared to meet, but which demand prompt action when tensions mount between a campus and its community.

With the advent of statewide coordinationg boards and commissions, many boards have been forced to reassess their prerogatives in view of the higher authority on the scene. In some states this has become quite complex as layer upon layer of power and authority are created. Almost all of the fifty states now have some form of statewide planning or controlling mechanism. On these developments, college builders may wish to consult two studies: one by Robert L. Williams of the University of Michigan (Legal Bases for Coordinating Boards of Higher Education In Thirty-nine States: 1967) and the other by Robert Berdahl (Statewide Coordination of Higher Education, American Council on Education, 1970).

Chapter VIII

CHANGE AND VITALITY

Of all the changes institutions may undergo, extinction is in many respects the most dramatic. Not far behind is the merger in which one institution gives up its identity as it coalesces with another, resembling the feudal demise of sovereignty to a successor. As has been noted in this report, there have been numerous deaths and several mergers, both in the sample and all colleges founded since 1947.

Mere name changes of institutions may be devices to attract or to reward new sources of support. In dropping one name and taking another the objective is to identify the institution with a person, a place, an idea, or an educational enterprise that is more auspicious than the old. Also, a college may change its name in an effort to reduce confusion with other organizations, or to achieve greater public awareness of its own mission or its altered character. About one-third of the new institutions surveyed had in fact changed their names, as table 8.1 indicates. From 30 to 38 percent of the three types of institutions, both public and private, had either changed names at the time of their founding, or between then and 1967 when the questionnaires were completed.

TABLE 8.1

Percentage of Institutions that Changed Names by Control, Type, and Size of Institution

Public	31
Private	34
2-Year	30
4-Year	33
Postbaccalaureate	38
Small	33
Medium	31
Large	50

Most Significant Changes and Successes

The presidents were asked two open-end questions of a general nature: "What do you believe are the most significant changes that have occurred in your institution since it was founded?" and "In your opinion, what do you view as the most significant successes of your institution, and to what do you attribute them?" The responses to both these questions were classified by a single code of fifteen items as follows:

1. Curriculum development and change (courses, programs);
2. Board relations - involvement, support, fund-raising;
3. Community relations - support, programs, leads;
4. Student development and involvement (quality of students, quantity of student participation, success of graduates);
5. Buildings and facilities development;
6. Budgetary growth;
7. Enrollment increase;
8. Accreditation;
9. More or better faculty;
10. Faculty involvement (participation in governance, loyalty);
11. Administrative capacity (change and more officers) - re-organization, qualified administration;
12. Relations with other institutions - merger, support, cooperation;
13. Change in institutional type (e.g., junior to senior college, religious to lay, terminal to transfer);
14. Greater opportunities for students - disadvantaged, adult education, location enabling more to attend college;
15. Improved relations among the various groups in the institution (students, faculty, board, administration).

The successes as well as the changes that were cited all pertained to the survival or improvement of an institution. Each item, moreover, is an element of collegiate operations that is potentially manipulable by college managers, though there is no way here of knowing to what extent these alterations were deliberate or fortuitous. In any case, the "most significant changes" and the "most significant successes" were tabulated by type of institution, status of control, and size. While these lengthy tabulations of numbers and percentages for all fifteen items are omitted for the sake of brevity, table 8.2 contains the essential findings.

TABLE 8.2

Presidents' Most Frequently Mentioned Changes and Successes
by Type, Control, and Size of Institution
(Top five ranks only)

Rank according to CHANGE									Rank according to SUCCESS							
Type			Control		Size				Type			Control		Size		
2-yr.	4-yr.	Post-bacc.	Pub.	Pvt.	Small	Med.	Large	Item[a]	2-yr.	4-yr.	Post-bacc.	Pub.	Pvt.	Small	Med.	Large
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Curriculum	3	2*	2	2	2	2	2	1*
2	2*	2	2	2	2	2	2	Building and Facilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	5	3	4	4	3	3	-	Institutional Type Change	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	-	-	3	-	5	-	5	Community Relations	1	4	5*	1	3	3	3	1*
-	2*	-	-	3	4	4	-	Student Development	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	3
-	4	4*	-	5	-	-	-	More and Better Faculty	5	5	3	5	5*	5	5	5
5	-	-	5	-	-	5	3	Enrollment Increase	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	4*	-	-	-	-	-	Administrative Capacity	-	-	5*	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	Faculty Involvement	4	2*	4	4	4	4	4	4
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Better Intra-Institution Relations[b]	-	-	-	-	5*	-	-	-

* Rank shared with another item.

a. Listed in rank order according to the frequency with which items were listed as significant changes by all respondents.

b. Ranked fourteenth when responses concerning change from all respondents are counted. Included in this list because it ranks fifth when only private responses to the success question are tallied.

Table 8.2 shows only one item in the top five as a "change" and a "success" in each of the eight institutional categories. That item is curriculum. It was rated most frequently as a significant change, no matter how the institutions were classed. It appears in the second position as a significant success for all types of institutions except junior colleges, where it ranks third and at the large institutions where it ranks first.

As to significant changes, buildings and facilities is the item ranked second by all groups, and institutional type change ranks third, fourth, or fifth in all categories except one, the large institutions.

Table 8.2 also shows that there is greater consistency in the listing of successes than of changes. Five items -- student development, curriculum, community relations, faculty involvement, and size and quality of faculty -- appear in the top five places as successes in every institutional category. Only two other items appear in the top five at all, and they tie for fifth position in two groups. This consistency may be the result of a general consensus among educators as to those goals or issues that would be conceived as successes, whereas the forces for change acting upon institutions seem to be more varied. Certainly their perceived impact on the several types of institutions would be different. The consistency of the "success" lists may also be due to some wishful thinking and self-congratulation on the part of the respondents. It was a rare president - but there were some - who indicated that it was too early to identify any significant successes, or that there were none.

These, then, were the changes and successes, some more frequently mentioned than others. But other critical factors in institutional vitality did not turn up in the most frequent five on any tabulation. These missing items deserve particular notice (table 8.3).

TABLE 8.3

Six Least Frequently Mentioned Changes and Successes by Type of Institution

Item[a]	Presidents' Responses (Percentage)					
	2-year		4-year		Postbaccalaureate	
	Change	Success	Change	Success	Change	Success
Board relationship . .	7	9	7	5	6	3
Accreditation	6	6	8	16	9	10
Relations with other institutions	4	2	10	4	10	7
Budget growth	5	8	5	12	11	10
Better intra-institution relations	4	13	8	15	4	9
Greater opportunities for students	4	10	-	7	3	3

[a] Listed in rank order according to the frequency with which they were mentioned as changes by all respondents.

All six of these elements have one thing in common. Each is a critically important factor in institutional development and adaptation. Lacking forward movement in these respects, no new college can expect much of a future. Even among old and well established institutions there are probably very few these days whose board relationships, financing, relations with other institutions, opportunities for students, and student-faculty-administration relationships are so favorable that deliberate changes and successes are of no significance.

For presidents at new and old institutions alike, these six variables may also be among the most difficult to alter, because each element is affected to so great a degree by social forces and power figures outside any president's sphere of authority. Governing boards, superboards, commissions, legislative committees, budget bureaus, higher levels of government at distant centers -- such agencies wield most power when it comes to the first five variables.

Importance and Difficulty of Some Adaptive Measures

Elsewhere in the survey questionnaire the presidents were asked to rate thirty-three "policies, projections, reflections" for degree of difficulty and also for the importance they attached to them. Among these items were four that are considered here because they pertain to adaptive change. They are found in table 8.4 along with the results presented by type of institution. Though the survey came more than three years after "The Movement" on campus had its start at Berkeley, the presidents of the new colleges attached neither much importance nor difficulty to dealing with student activists. One infers from this that most of the new campuses were not very activist.

TABLE 8.4

Presidents' Rating of Importance and Difficulty of Four Adaptive Measures by Type of Institution

Problem	Presidents' Responses (Percentage)					
	2-Year		4-Year		Postbaccalaureate	
	Highly Important	Difficult	Highly Important	Difficult	Highly Important	Difficult
Dealing with student activists	19	16	25	14	13	27
Attracting students from disadvantaged homes	48	53	36	56	38	55
Developing constructive working relations with other institutions	57	37	50	46	41	37
Communicating objectives of the institution to community	83	59	60	60	61	64

Communicating objectives of the institution to the community was most often important as well as difficult. Many community college presidents more frequently than others ranked this community-focused item highly important, and less frequently difficult.

Tabulation of the same items by size of institution is presented in table 8.5 in addition to the preceding table because the perspective of size yields some rather interesting results. With regard to the first two items, student activists and disadvantaged students, difficulty and size were associated; the larger the institution the more frequently both were regarded as difficult. The importance of attracting disadvantaged students was also associated with size of institution.

TABLE 8.5

Presidents' Rating of Importance and Difficulty of Four Adaptive Measures by Size of Institution

Problem	Presidents' Responses (Percentage)					
	Small		Medium		Large	
	Highly Important	Difficult	Highly Important	Difficult	Highly Important	Difficult
Dealing with student activists	18	9	21	28	17	39
Attracting students from disadvantaged homes	38	52	55	55	63	79
Developing constructive working relations with other institutions	55	43	52	33	50	33
Communicating objectives of the institution to community	76	61	77	62	63	58

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Roger W. Heyns, President

The American Council on Education, founded in 1918, is a council of educational organizations and institutions. Its purpose is to advance education and educational methods through comprehensive voluntary and cooperative action on the part of American educational associations, organizations, and institutions.